Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. IX APRIL, 1938 No. 4

A Course in Lutheran Theology

Those who feel the need of acquiring a deeper understanding of the saving truths of the Bible will do well to take up the study of Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio.* That will provide an excellent course in Lutheran theology. Study and restudy the weighty matters presented in this course, and you will become a proficient and efficient Christian theologian.

There are those, indeed, who will tell you that the study of this book is profitless and harmful. A. Ritschl, the liberal theologian, labels the book "a wretched botchery." H. Grisar, the Catholic writer, declares: "Not true humility but a suicidal detraction of the nature of man inspired the miserable treatise." (See Aulén, *Das christliche Gottesbild,* p. 219, and *Lehre u. Wehre,* 56, p. 72.) Nor do the Lutheran synergists think much of our book. In his book *Martin Luther, a Destiny,* published 1927, L. Febvre, professor at Strassburg, describes Melanchthon's reaction to *De Servo Arbitrio* thus: "In 1525 also occurred the decisive, inescapable, irremedial rupture with Erasmus, the violent shock of the two irreconcilable viewpoints. But Melanchthon cared for Erasmus, admired him, and could not join in Luther's delirious outbursts against him. . . . No. Luther was wrong in preaching predestination and writing that inopportune, violent, and dangerous tract on the subject against Erasmus. He was wrong to repudiate free will; it made the vulgar, who did not understand him, averse to all effort, to all personal and moral initiative. Melanchthon indicates this in 1525 in his Latin articles written during his trip. . . . He develops the thought in great detail in the *Loci Communes* of 1535. He restores to the human will and human cooperation their dignity as a means of salvation. As the theologians say, he becomes (or rebecomes)

a synergist." (P. 296 ff.)[1] It is not a matter for surprise that Melanchthon and Ritschl and Grisar do not like this course in Christian theology. A teacher who so emphatically stresses the *sola gratia*, so uncompromisingly maintains that the sinner owes his salvation in no wise to his merit and activity but solely and in all respects to the grace and activity of God cannot expect to enroll such students in his course as insist that the sinner has much or at least something to do with his salvation.

There are others who think highly of this book. Walther speaks of it as "a powerful treatise." E. T. Vaughn, who translated it in 1823 into English, declares: "I count this a truly estimable, magnificent, and illustrious treatise." Theod. Harnack thought much of it: "Diese gewaltige, wohlueberlegte und vortrefflich geschriebene Schrift zaehlt zu *den grossen Taten* des Reformators." (*Luthers Theologie*, p. 178.) Luther himself thought much of it: "I am much averse to having a collection of my books published and do not care to lend a hand to it; rather would I, impelled by a Saturnian craving, see them all destroyed. For I do not recognize any of them as fully expressing my thoughts, with the possible exception of the *Bondage of the Will* and the *Catechism*." (XXI b, 2176;[2] XVIII, 66 [Introduction]; Weimar ed., 18, 596.) And the Formula of Concord endorses the book and charges all men to study it: "In these words Dr. Luther ascribes to our free will no power whatever to qualify itself for righteousness or strive after it. . . . Even so Dr. Luther wrote of this matter also in his book *De Servo Arbitrio, i. e.*, Of the Captive Will of Man, in opposition to Erasmus, and elucidated and supported this position well and thoroughly . . .; to which we also hereby appeal and refer others — *ut diligenter legantur, omnes hortamur.*" (*Trigl.*, p. 897.)

---

1) Cp. *Conc. Theol. Month.*, VI, p. 258; *Concordia Triglotta*, Hist. Introd., p. 209; W. Walther, *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, p. 302; Otto Schumacher, *Martin Luther, Vom Unfreien Willen*, p. 11. C. F. W. Walther, *Lehre u. Wehre*, 29, p. 173: "Als ihm [Erasmus] aber Luther hierauf im Jahre 1525 seine gewaltige Schrift *De Servo Arbitrio* entgegengesetzt hatte, da trieb dieselbe gleich einem Sturmwind alle Vernunftmenschen wie Staub von der Tenne der Kirche der Reformation. Da gingen, wie einst zu Christi Zeit, viele hinter sich oder lebten doch von nun an in ihrer Gemeinschaft mit Luther bis zu dessen Tode unter einem gewissen Drucke." Adolf Koeberle, *The Quest for Holiness*, p. 140: "Melanchthon and the Philippists were already afraid that as a result of Luther's harsh deterministic statements concerning the bondage of the will ('the condemnation of those who have not deserved it'), the practical-ethical side of faith as an inner decision might be lost. So his followers formulated, with the greatest caution, the teaching *de tribus causis efficientibus, concurrentibus in conversione hominis non renati.*" — These "harsh deterministic statements" of Luther will be examined in the final article of this series.

2) References given in this form indicate the St. Louis edition of Luther's works. — See Vol. XVIII, 1670 ff. for the German translation of *De Servo Arbitrio:* "Dass der freie Wille nichts sei."

Let us diligently study these things — the great truth that salvation is of the Lord, not of man, and the other weighty matters that Luther discusses in connection with his central theme. There are many such weighty matters. This book is, as the editor of the St. Louis edition of Luther's works points out, "an outstanding model and compendium of true Bible-theology" (XVIII, Introd., p. 66). We need to study it. We are indeed somewhat acquainted with these doctrines. But studying them as Luther here presents them and dealing with the burning words which the importance of these subjects put into his heart and mouth, we shall receive an increased measure of Luther's spirit. — Let us put down our notes under three main heads. The first is the sole authority of Scripture.

De Servo Arbitrio could not have been written if Luther had not come under the full sway of the Holy Scripture, the sacred Word of God. If Luther had been in submission to human authority, the authority of reason and the authority of "the Church" and the fathers, he would have collaborated on Erasmus's *De Libero Arbitrio* or subscribed to it. It is not in the power of reason, not in the power of man, to so completely strip human nature of its spiritual powers that man will confess: I can do nothing; the gracious Lord must do all. But Luther was able to write *De Servo Arbitrio* because he had become a bond-servant, a glad bond-servant, of Holy Scripture. Let Erasmus marshal his great host of human authorities on the side of free will, Luther declares: "These things have no effect upon us" (p. 82 of the Cole-Atherton translation: *The Bondage of the Will.* Eerdman's Publ. Co.[3]); the Christian will rather say this — I will steadily adhere to the Sacred Writings everywhere and in all parts of them and assert them" (p. 22). Luther will not make a single theological statement that is not made by Scripture. He will engage in no controversy unless the opponent agrees to submit all questions to this judge. And Erasmus agrees. "You promise 'that you will go according to the canonical Scriptures, and that, because Luther is swayed by the authority of no other writer whatever.'" (P. 81. See *Diatribe,* De Libero Arbitrio, XVIII, 1607.)

In spite of the agreement Erasmus kept harping on the authority of the Fathers and of "the Church." He appealed to "the great number of the most learned men, approved by the consent of so many ages, among whom were some of the most extensively acquainted with the sacred writings and also some of the most holy martyrs, many renowned for miracles, together with the more recent theologians and so many colleges, councils, bishops, and Popes" (p. 82. *Diatribe,* XVIII, 1607), "the whole choir of the

3) Where only the page is designated, the reference is to the Cole-Atherton translation.

saints"; "from the days of the apostles to the present day there has not been a single writer who so completely annulled the power of free will save only Manichaeus and John Wyclif" (*Diatribe*, XVIII, 1608). The *Diatribe* closes with the appeal to the reader, "whether it is right to reject the teaching of so many Church Fathers" (XVIII, 1667).

Luther makes answer: "These things have no effect upon us." "It is a settled determination with me not to argue upon the authority of any teacher whatever but upon that of Scripture alone." (P. 210.) "Is it not enough that you submit your opinion to the Scriptures? Do you submit it to the decrees of the Church also? What can the Church decree that is not decreed in the Scriptures? If it can, where, then, remains the liberty and power of judging those who make the decrees, as Paul, 1 Cor. 14, teaches: 'Let others judge'? . . . You would take away from us the power of judging the decrees of men and give it unto men without judgment. Where does the Scripture of God command us to do this?" (P. 22. — XVIII, 1678.) "Christ is better than the authority of the Fathers." (P. 64.) And wherever the Fathers disregarded Christ, Paul, the Holy Scriptures, Luther disregarded them. "Go now, then, and boast of the authorities of the ancients and depend on what they say; all of whom, you see, to a man disregarded Paul, that most plain and most clear teacher, and, as it were, purposely shunned this morning-star, yea, this sun rather, because, being wrapped up in their own carnal reason, they thought it absurd that no place should be left to merit." (P. 357.) It was not an easy matter for Luther thus to renounce allegiance to these time-honored authorities. "These had such weight with me for upwards of ten years that I think no other mortal was ever so much under their sway." (P. 82.) But now he had come under the blessed sway of Scripture. Scripture meant everything to him, the Fathers, where they disregarded Scripture, nothing. When Erasmus quotes Jerome on Is. 40: 2 against him (and against Isaiah), his blood is stirred, and he cries out: "I hear you, Jerome says so; therefore it is true! — I am disputing about Isaiah, who here speaks in the clearest words, and Jerome is cast in my teeth. . . . Where now is that promise of ours by which we agreed at the outset 'that we would go according to the Scriptures and not according to the commentaries of men'?" (P. 280.) And on Is. 40: 6, 7: "Here again the trifling vanities of Jerome are cast in my teeth instead of Isaiah." (P. 286.) He heard the Lord speaking to him in the words of Scripture, and his Christian conscience would not permit him to subordinate Christ's word to the words of men. "I call God for a record upon my soul that I should have continued so" (swayed by human authorities) "had not an urging conscience and an evidence of things forced me into a

different path." (P. 82 f.)[4] And there was this other consideration: "In the mean time, Friend Erasmus, what will the soul do that shall be bound and murdered by that iniquitous statute? Is that nothing to you?" (P. 63.) Erasmus had propounded the monstrous proposition "that, if anything were settled upon in the councils that was wrong, it ought not to be openly confessed, lest a handle should be thereby afforded for contemning the authority of the Fathers." This is an extreme case: in the interest of maintaining the authority of the Fathers, Erasmus refuses to warn men against certain iniquitous statutes established by the councils. These men are guilty of murdering souls, of murdering those souls which obey the wicked statutes. But Luther's charge applies in every case. Every one who maintains the principle of the authority of the Fathers is guilty of leading men into soul-destroying errors, because many of the Fathers have taught such errors. For instance: "They thought it absurd that no place should be left to merit." And more, even if the Fathers had not taught a single error, if the councils had not enacted a single iniquitous statute, the principle that the teachings of the Fathers and of the Church are binding upon the conscience is wicked and soul-destroying in itself. It puts men in the place of God. And it destroys the foundation of faith. Saving faith rests solely on God's own Word.

Luther did not disparage the Fathers. He studied their writings as diligently as Erasmus did. He thought highly of them. He profited greatly by them. It does not accord with the Lutheran spirit to throw the writings of the Fathers of the Christian Church and of the Lutheran Church on the junk-pile. We have been taught to study them reverently and lovingly. Walther has impressed upon us that "it is arrogance, which God would punish, if, in getting doctrine out of Scripture, a person refuses to be aided by others or will not study the writings of the great teachers but endeavors to find everything in Scripture himself. See note to § 3 of his *Pastorale*" (F. Pieper, *Conversion and Election*, p. 96). Luther studied the writings of the Fathers with a reverent and loving mind, and we are now reading and examining a writing of Luther with the same mind. That is the Lutheran spirit. Luther did not disparage the Fathers. He did disparage and disregard them, how-

4) Prof. Febvre quotes from a letter Luther wrote to Strassburg (Erl. ed., 53, 274. — St. L. ed., XV, 2050): "I was strongly drawn to the idea" (Carlstadt's idea of the Lord's Supper). "I struggled; I saw clearly that I could thus strike the strongest blow to the Papacy. But what of it? I was bound; I could not throw off the restraint. The Word is too strong; nothing can tear it from my soul." And then he remarks: "Luther deceived himself. It was his sentiment, his religious instinct, that 'bound' him." (*Op. cit.*, p. 268.) That is a mean slur — and a rather senseless one. Certainly Luther's "religious instinct," or as Luther expresses it, "his conscience," bound him, because the Word bound his conscience.

ever, when "they disregarded Paul." "All that I say concerning those saints of yours, or rather *ours*" (Did Luther disparage the Fathers?), "is this: Those should be selected who have spoken the best, that is, who have spoken in defense of grace and against 'free will,' and those left who, through the infirmity of the flesh, have borne witness of the flesh rather than of the spirit. And also, that those who are inconsistent with themselves should be selected and caught at in those parts of their writings where they speak from the spirit, and left where they savor of the flesh. This is what becomes a Christian reader." (P. 101. — XVIII, 1740.) In a letter written 1516 Luther had stated: "When it comes to Scriptural interpretation, I prefer Augustine to Jerome exactly as much as he, Erasmus, prefers Jerome to Augustine." (Enders, *Briefwechsel*, p. 63 f.)[5] The Christian has the right and the duty to subject any statement of any theologian to the judgment of Scripture. Lutheran theology does not make "the infirmities of the Fathers" (p. 94) the source of doctrine. The Lutheran slogan is: Not the Fathers but Scripture. Luther says elsewhere: "Let us first and principally read the Holy Scriptures, and afterwards we may read also the Fathers; *yet with discretion*, for the Fathers have not always taught and thought right of the things of God. He that will leave the Bible and deal only with the comment and books of the Fathers, his study will be endless and profitless." (XXII, p. 30.) Profitless and harmful and soul-destroying!

Lutheran theology does not recognize the authority of the Fathers — nor the authority of reason. *De Servo Arbitrio* is the declaration of war against rationalism in theology.[6] Reason has at all times sought to dominate theology. The Fathers who spoke for free will had been listening to reason. "Being wrapped up in their own carnal reason, they thought it absurd that no place should be left for merit." (P. 357.) And Erasmus was continually appealing to reason. He continually forgot what he had professed in the opening paragraphs of the *Diatribe:* "I submit my reason at all times and at once to the inviolable authority of Scripture and the decrees of the councils, whether I comprehend it or not." (XVIII, 1601.) He never did so. "At one time you fly to the interpretations of the Fathers; at another to absurdities of reason." (P. 291.)

---

5) Naturally Erasmus and Febvre and others will object that, in applying the criterion: They have spoken the best who have spoken in defense of grace and against free will, Luther is led by his subjective bias. We shall refer to that later on.

6) "It has been said that, instead of entitling their papers *On Free Will* and *On Predestination*, the two antagonists might have named them *On Natural Religion* and *On Supernatural Religion.*" (Febvre, *op. cit.*, p. 271.) This much is true: "The doctrinal controversy of 1525 marked more clearly the sharp line between rationalists and Bible theologians." (*Four Hundred Years*, p. 60.)

"You see therefore, again, how rashly you run against the Word of God, as though you preferred far before it your own counsel and cogitations." (P. 61.) For instance: "It appears absurd" (says the *Diatribe*) "that God, who is not only just but also good, should be said to have hardened the heart of a man in order that by his iniquity He might show forth His own power." (P. 219.) Reason is continually protesting against the teaching of Scripture. "Why does God not, then, change, in His motion, those evil wills which He moves? . . . Why did He permit Adam to fall?" (P. 230.) And men are lost, eternally, by reason of the fall which God permitted! Reason rebels at this seeming injustice. "It is insolvable how God can damn him who by his own powers can do nothing but sin and become guilty." (P. 389.) And it is particularly in the matter of the *cur alii, alii non* that carnal reason goes into paroxysms of indignation and resentment.[7] It protests violently "that the fault is not in the miserable man but in the unjust God; nor can they judge otherwise of that God who crowns this wicked man freely without any merit and yet crowns not, but damns, another who is perhaps less, or at least not more, wicked" (p. 389. — XVIII, 1966). Luther refuses to solve these insolvable matters; they "belong to those secrets of Majesty where 'His judgments are past finding out'" (p. 230). Erasmus, rather than be charged by his reason with teaching "absurdities," chooses to deny the *sola gratia*. And this is the answer he gets from Luther: "It appears absurd (says the *Diatribe*). . . . It appears, then, that one of the principal causes why the words of Moses and of Paul are not received is their absurdity. But against what article of faith does that absurdity militate? . . . According to the same argument of absurdity you will deny all the articles of faith, because it is of all things the most absurd, and, as Paul says, foolishness to the Gentiles and a stumbling-block to the Jews, that God should be man, the son of a virgin, crucified, and sitting at the right hand of His Father; it is, I say, absurd to believe such things. Therefore let us invent some tropes with the Arians and say that Christ is not truly God. . . . These things, reason will still say, are not becoming a God, good and merciful. . . . But she will comprehend that, when this shall be said of God: He hardens no one, He damns no one; but He has mercy upon all, He saves all, and He has so utterly destroyed hell that no future punishment need be dreaded. It is thus that reason blusters and contends in attempting to clear God." (P. 219 f. — XVIII, 1831 f.) It is not safe to take reason for our guide. And it is not right. It leads men to rebel against the majesty of God, to demand that God relinquish His throne. "The other absurd objection the *Diatribe* gathers from

7) This matter will be treated more fully in the final article of this series.

Madam Reason. . . . Here they require that God should act according to human laws and do what seems right unto men or cease to be God." (P. 265.) "This is what we come to when we attempt by human reason to limit and make excuses for God, not revering the secrets of His Majesty, but curiously prying into them, being lost in the glory of them; instead of making one excuse for God, we pour forth a thousand blasphemies." (P. 217. — XVIII, 1830.) Yes, they lose God who judge of Him according to reason. "If this righteousness were such that it was considered to be righteousness according to human judgment, it would be no longer divine, nor would it in any thing differ from human righteousness." (P. 386. — XVIII, 1963.) And on this same page: "What is man compared with God?" And you dare set your judgment against the declaration of Scripture! Luther will not recognize any man as a Lutheran who contends for the right of reason to interpret Scripture. Where Luther's spirit prevails, the rationalizing of Erasmus and of Melanchthon and their followers must depart. As Walther remarks: *De Servo Arbitrio* drives all rationalizers from the floor of the Church of the Reformation; those that remain must feel out of place.

There is no room in the Lutheran Church for those who set up, in place of the authority of Scripture, the authority of the Fathers or of reason or of "the Spirit"[8] or any other human authority, the Christian self-consciousness or the Christian experience or whatever other alias it assumes. Those theologians within the Lutheran Church who do not operate exclusively with the *sola Scriptura* have lost the spirit of Luther. And there are many such. There was a time when men said, referring to Luther's controversy with Erasmus, that "owing to Luther the world was ready to rely solely on the clear word of Scripture." (See Weimar ed., 18, 581.) And what is the situation today? Prominent theologians within the Lutheran Church are denouncing the appeal to the *sola Scriptura* as — Biblicism. Yes, Luther himself was a — Biblicist! Editor Laible of the *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung* knows the situation in Europe and protests: "Ah, this 'it is written,' this, too, is now antiquated — 'Biblicism'!" (1931, p. 5.) Here are a few typical pronouncements. The Swedish leader G. Aulén has no use for "the old Biblicism, which restricts the divine revelation to the Bible." "Biblicism, the application of the theory of verbal inspiration, laid its heavy hand on the theology of orthodoxy." "*Die schicksalsschwerste Gabe des Biblizismus*"; "the disastrous consequences of this theory." "Luther was partly

8) "I had the last year, and have still, a sharp warfare with those fanatics who subject the Scriptures to the interpretation of their own boasted spirit." (P. 102. — XVIII, 1741.)

influenced by Biblicism. He sees that Scripture speaks of obduration: God hardens Pharaoh, etc., and he feels that such statements must be accepted"; "Luther's slavish dependence on the proof-texts." (*Das christliche Gottesbild,* 221, 251, 255, 346, 386.) P. Althaus, a leader of the Lutheran Church in Germany, denounces Biblicism, which "identifies the Word of God and Scripture" and looks upon "the Bible as the supernatural, infallible textbook (*Lehrbuch*)"; for "Scripture is not an absolutely infallible *Lehrbuch von Wahrheiten.*" "Our doctrine of justification is not simply a repetition of the New Testament doctrine, and our eschatology is not simply a repetition of the Biblical doctrine but has its own form." (*Die Letzten Dinge,* 4th ed., 61, 67, 74, 250.) The same voice is heard here in America. The *Lutheran* of September 24, 1936, for instance, after discussing the "Biblicism of later dogmaticians," sets up this principle: "When we speak of the authority of the Scriptures, we do not mean that they are independently authoritative. They have no authority either apart from Christ, who is the primary authority,[9] or apart from the Church, in which Christ's power is operative." They say it is no longer admissible to prove a theological statement with proof-texts. This method of the Biblicists has gone by the board. Dr. E. E. Flack declares: "No fundamental doctrine rests on a single, isolated passage. Nor may several passages strung together in proof-text fashion fix faith." (*Lutheran,* Oct. 11, 1936.) *De Servo Arbitrio* applies the proof-text method. The body of the book is nothing else than the exposition of some 57 passages of Scripture. Beginning with Gen. 6:3, Luther strings together some 57 simple proof-texts, besides adducing incidentally a number of others, laboriously studies their true sense according to grammar and context, and publishes this study in Bible-passages as a theological treatise! Luther's one argument is: "It is written." That was the fashion in 1525. Today the liberal J. S. Whale declares: "The

9) The sinister purpose back of this modern distinction between the authority of Scripture and the authority of Christ is to wean men away from the sole authority of Scripture. For the same purpose these men denounce the appeal to the bare word of Scripture as legalistic; taking the doctrine directly and exclusively from the Bible would be degrading the Bible to a legal code. With Luther, however, the authority of the Bible and the authority of Christ coincide. Christ reveals His will to us nowhere but in the Bible, and the teaching of the Bible is clothed with the authority of Christ. And Luther did not study and use the Bible in a legalistic spirit. His theology was Christocentric. He sought for, and found, Christ in the Bible. "Take Christ out of the Scriptures, and what will you find remaining in them?" (P. 26.) He loved, and clung to, the words of the Bible because Christ was there. — Which is the *primary* authority, Christ or the Bible? Such a question is foreign to the spirit of Luther. — And what about the statement: "The Scriptures have no authority apart from the Church"? Authority of the *Church,* of *men? That* is legalism, pure and simple.

Bible is abused when it is used merely as an armory of proof-texts for defending some theological scheme" (*The Christian Answer to the Problem of Evil,* p. 77), and the Lutheran Flack asks Luther: Have you nothing else to offer us than proof-texts? They want something better than just the simple words of the Bible.

The trouble is, they no longer believe in the inspiration of Scripture. So they necessarily criticize Luther for employing the proof-text method. The historical introduction to *De Servo Arbitrio* in the Weimar edition (18, p. 596) praises the book: "Auch von unserm Standpunkt aus gesehen, bleibt diese Schrift eine Grosstat des Reformators"; but on page 595 it pronounces this criticism: "Was die Schrift *De Servo Arbitrio* selbst betrifft, so muss gesagt werden: 'Luther haelt sich in ihr nicht rein auf dem Boden der religioesen Erfahrung.' (Koestlin-Kawerau, *M. Luther,* I, 662.) Wo er beweist, arbeitet er mit einer fuer uns nicht mehr ueberzeugenden . . . theologischen Methode. Ihren Ausgangspunkt hat dieselbe fuer den vorliegenden Gegenstand in den *Theologumenen des Paulus* in Roem. 9:ff." Naturally one cannot adduce statements of Paul as proof if these statements are not God's words but merely some good man's *theologumena* — his human opinions.[10] A better authority than the uninspired Scriptures is needed. The fashionable authority just now is the "Christian experience." See, for instance, what the Weimar editor just said about Luther and his "religious experience."[11] There are today only a few theologians who are willing to be classed as Biblicists. The majority has renounced the supreme and sole authority of Scripture.

The generation of 1938 needs the spirit of 1525. Men must realize that any teaching which destroys or weakens the authority of the

---

10) Give up verbal inspiration, and you lose Scripture as the one absolute authority. That is a fine statement by Laible: "Ah, this 'it is written,' this, too, is now antiquated — 'Biblicism'! . . . Denying the authority of Scripture, you lose the light of God, the one help in the night that is upon us, the only guide the Church has."

11) Men are so thoroughly convinced that "experience" is the final authority in theology that they are able to read this idea even into Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio.* In his book *Der Streit zwischen Luther und Erasmus* K. Zickendraht, Lic. Theol., says on page 73: "Erasmus hatte die Frage, wer Schiedsrichter sein sollte, nominell doch zugunsten der kirchlichen Autoritaeten entschieden. Demgegenueber wird in Luthers Ausfuehrungen, welche an jenen nur dasjenige als Autoritaet anerkennen, was mit seiner religioes-sittlichen Erfahrung stimmt, zunaechst einfach stillschweigend diese zum Schiedsrichter gemacht." And this is the proof offered for this monstrous assertion: "Nach der Richtschnur dieser inneren Erfahrung, nach dem *iudicium conscientiae,* beurteilt er nun zunaechst auch die Geltung aller von Erasmus vorgebrachten Autoritaeten." (P. 74.) He is referring to the statement quoted above: ". . . had not an urging conscience and an evidence of things forced me into a different path." Luther was swayed by his conscience, surely. But what bound his conscience? His conscience and experience or Scripture?

Bible is an antichristian iniquity. We need to be filled with the holy indignation and fierce wrath which inspired the burning words of Luther: "If this be the attitude of Rome, then blessed be the land of Greece, blessed be the land of Bohemia, blessed be all those who have separated themselves and gone out from this Babylon. . . . As matters now stand, faith has been extinguished in her midst, the Gospel proscribed, Christ is banished, and the morals are worse than barbarian. Still there remained one hope: the inviolable authority of Holy Scripture remained, men had at least the right view of the Bible, though not the right understanding of its sense. But now Satan is capturing this, too, the stronghold of Zion and the tower of David, unconquered up till now." (XVIII, 425 f.; written 1520.) And the modern Protestant theologians are the faithful allies of the Pope!

The article of the authority of Scripture stands and falls with the article of the clearness of Scripture. If the teachings of Scripture were dark and uncertain, they could not serve as the source and norm of doctrine. "If Scripture be obscure or ambiguous, what need was there for its being sent down from heaven?" (p. 108.) Erasmus operates with "that pestilent saying of the Sophists 'The Scriptures are obscure and ambiguous' "; Luther, on the contrary, takes this position: "This ought, above all things, to be received and most firmly settled among the Christians, that the Holy Scriptures are a spiritual light, by far more clear than the sun itself, especially in those things which pertain unto salvation or which the Christians must necessarily know." (P. 104. — XVIII, 1742.) "This indeed I confess that there are many *places* in the Scriptures obscure and abstruse; not from the majesty of the things, but from our ignorance of certain terms and grammatical particulars; but which do not prevent a knowledge of all the *things* in the Scriptures" (the saving doctrine). (P. 25.) Luther is sure of his position. "What is more frequently said in praise of Scripture than that it is a most certain and most clear light? Ps. 119, 105." "And what is the design of the apostles in proving their preaching by the Scriptures? Is it that they may obscure their own darkness by still greater darkness? . . . The apostles as well as Christ Himself appealed to the Scriptures as the most clear testimonies of the truth of their discourses. With what face, then, do we make them obscure?" "In a word, if Scripture be obscure or ambiguous, what need was there for its being sent down from heaven? Are we not obscure and ambiguous enough in ourselves without an increase of it by obscurity, ambiguity, and darkness being sent down from heaven? And if this be the case, what will become of that of the apostle: 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction'? 2 Tim.

3:16." (P. 106 ff. — XVIII, 1744 ff.) And, again, "if Scripture as they declare, be obscure, who shall certify us that their declaration is to be depended on? Shall it be certified by another new declaration? But who shall make that declaration? — And so we may go on *ad infinitum.*" (P. 108.) No, God has given us "the all-clear Scriptures" (p. 27), "the all-clear light of the Scriptures" (p. 290), and it is a pestilent, "an impudent and blasphemous saying: 'The Scriptures are obscure.'" (P. 109.) It is a blasphemous saying; could not the Holy Spirit express Himself clearly? It is a pestilent doctrine; it destroys the authority of Scripture.

Men today still argue after the manner of Erasmus: "If, then, the Scripture be quite clear, why have men of renowned talent, through so many ages, been blind upon this point?" (P. 114. *Diatribe,* XVIII, 1609.) This text and that text, they say, cannot be clear because there are contradictory interpretations of it. All denominations appeal to Scripture. "They each claim it as belonging to them." (P. 102; cp. p. 402.) How, then, can you say that Scripture speaks in a clear, unmistakable manner? Luther makes answer: "All heresies and errors in the Scriptures have not arisen from the simplicity of the words, as is the general report throughout the world, but from men not attending to the simplicity of the words and hatching tropes and conclusions out of their own brain." (P. 206.) Let us take courage from Luther and, when dealing with such a case, declare: "If many things still remain abstruse to many, this does not arise from obscurity in the Scriptures but from their own blindness or want of understanding." (P. 27.) Yes, at times we will have to meet the assertion of the errorist that this and that passage is "uncertain and obscure" in the manner of Luther: "No wonder; for all that the *Diatribe* aims at is to make the Scriptures of God in every place obscure to the intent that it might not be compelled to use them." (P. 306.) And as to the matter in hand, dealing with the great host of the synergists, who refuse to accept the clear teaching of Scripture, Luther delivers this telling blow: "Why have men of renowned talent been blind upon this point? I answer: They have been thus blind to the praise and glory of 'free will,' in order that that highly-boasted-of 'power by which a man is able to apply himself unto those things that pertain unto eternal salvation' might be eminently displayed, that very exalted power, which neither sees those things which it sees nor hears those things which it hears and much less understands and seeks after them." (P. 114 f.) — The heretics contrive so to manipulate and twist the clearest text that they and their dupes can no longer see its plain meaning. "And no wonder; for even the sun itself would not shine if it should be assailed by such arts as these." (P. 231.)

Finally there is that glorious assurance of Luther. He was certain of his doctrine. There he stands like a rock, immovable. For his theology is grounded on, and grown out of, and grown together with, Scripture, the unmovable rock. Lutheran theology is the theology of certainty. The Lutheran theologian has firm convictions. The Erasmian has no firm convictions. He cannot be certain of his doctrine because he does not take his doctrine from Scripture. "He looks upon the Christian doctrines as nothing better than the opinions of philosophers and men." (P. 23.) "He would make it appear that there has been nothing certain in the Christian religion." (From a letter of Luther to Amsdorf, p. 394. — XVIII, 1993.) He does "not delight in assertions" and censures in Luther "an obstinacy of assertion." (P. 18. *Diatribe*, XVIII, 1601.) And certain teachings of Scripture must not be spoken out loud. "Although they are true in themselves, yet it would not be prudent to prostitute them to the ears of every one." (P. 48. *Diatribe*, XVIII, 1605.) What is the Lutheran attitude? "Not to delight in assertions is not the character of the Christian mind; nay, he must delight in assertions, or he is not a Christian. . . . By *assertion* I mean a constant adhering, affirming, confessing, defending, and invincible persevering. Moreover, I speak concerning the asserting of those things which are delivered to us from above in the Holy Scriptures. . . . Nothing is more known or more general among Christians than assertions. Take away assertions, and you take away Christianity. Nay; the Holy Spirit is given unto them from heaven that He may glorify Christ and confess Him even unto death." (XVIII, 1676: "damit er [Christus] bis zum Tode bekannt werde"). "Allow us to be assertors and to study and delight in assertions; and do you favor your skeptics and academics until Christ shall have called you also. The Holy Spirit is not a skeptic, nor are what He has written on our hearts doubts or opinions, but assertions more certain and more firm than life itself and all human experience." (Pp. 18–24.)

Luther is certain of his doctrine; for Scripture teaches these things as the absolute truth and teaches them clearly and definitely. The Erasmian theologian, who is guided by reason and human experience, is never sure of his position, is unwilling to assert things positively, and refuses to confess them unto death. But Luther is dealing with Scripture, and through Scripture the Holy Spirit wrote on his heart firm convictions and certain assertions. Here there is no shilly-shallying, no trimming and evading, no halting and vacillating, no fear and hesitancy to speak out. Here there are clear-cut, straightforward propositions, and they are put forward as the absolute truth. "Let that Christian be anathema who is not certain in, and does not follow, that which is enjoined

him." (P. 23.) "That obstinate assertor Luther urges his cause by the Scriptures"! (P. 315.)

The Christian theologian has no choice here. Scripture leaves him but one course: "Truth and doctrine are to be preached always, openly, and firmly and are never to be dissembled or concealed." (P. 61.) And more, Scripture does not merely command it, but drives him on with kindly compelling force to give voice to its blessed teaching. The Christian theologian cannot but speak of these things with conviction — and with a loud voice. "As to my always conducting discussions with ardor, I acknowledge my fault, if it be a fault; nay, I greatly glory in this testimony which the world bears of me in the cause of God; and may God Himself confirm the same testimony on the Last Day! Then who more happy than Luther — to be honored with the universal testimony of his age that he did not maintain the Cause of Truth lazily nor deceitfully but with a real, if not too great, ardor" ("oder vielmehr allzu heftig," XVIII, 1913: "vel potius nimio"). "Then shall I be blessedly clear from that word of Jeremiah: 'Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully ('negligently'), Jer. 48:10." (P. 322.) — Luther could not suppress a single truth nor speak of any truth of Scripture coldly and indifferently. God's Word was in his heart as a burning fire; he could not stay, Jer. 20:9.

Furthermore, the troubled conscience needs certainty. It cannot rest in probabilities. "What is more miserable than uncertainty?" (P. 22.) And it needs assurance on all points of doctrine. What, keep silence on certain truths and have "souls bound and murdered" by adhering to the error? "Is that nothing to you?" (P. 63.) You may "care nothing whatever about the certainty of Scripture. But as for me who labor to establish consciences nothing can be more inconvenient, nothing more injurious, nothing more pestilential," than your "convenient interpretation." (P. 307 f. — XVIII, 1901.)

But to speak out so boldly, to proclaim all Scripture-truths without any suppression, subtraction, adjustment, and smoothing down, will cause many to turn against the Bible and will bring on all kinds of tumult and endanger the peace of the Church. So said Erasmus. Melanchthon felt the same way. And countless numbers today have the same fear. But Luther refused to keep silence on any point of doctrine. Least of all would he make any compromise in the doctrine of the bondage of the will. "Some, you say, are of that nature, that, although they are true in themselves, yet it would not be prudent to prostitute them to the ears of every one. . . . As I have said before, those things which are either found in the Sacred Writings or may be proved by them are not only plain but wholesome and therefore may be, nay, ought to be,

spread abroad, learned and known." (P. 48.) "And as to 'a fear that many who are depravedly inclined will abuse this liberty,' these are not to be considered of so much consequence as that, for the sake of restraining their abuse, the Word of God should be taken out of the way." (P. 59.) "Truth and doctrine are to be preached always, openly, firmly, and are never to be dissembled or concealed; for there is no offense in them; they are the staff of uprightness." (P. 61.) "You would have us, for the sake of the Popes, the heads, and the peace of the community, to put off, upon an occasion, and depart from, the all-certain Word of God." You fear the tumults that will otherwise arise. Do you not know that tumults must arise where the truth, the full truth is preached? "Such is most constantly the case with the Word of God that because of it the world is thrown into tumult, Matt. 10:34; Luke 12:49; 2 Cor. 6:5. Ps. 2: The nations are in tumult, the people roaring, the kings rising up, and the princes conspiring against the Lord." (P. 55.)[12] Luther would rather die than keep silence in this matter — and be eternally damned: "I am, in this discussion, seeking an object solemn and essential; nay, such and so great that it ought to be maintained and defended through death itself.... Since it cannot be otherwise, I choose rather to be battered in temporal tumult, happy in the grace of God, for God's Word's sake, which is to be maintained with a mind incorrupt and invincible, than to be ground to powder in eternal tumult, under the wrath of God and torments intolerable." (P. 54. — XVIII, 1703.) No, you cannot stop the mouth of a Luther. He was no opportunist, indifferentist, skeptic, dissembler.

And you cannot stop his mouth by calling him an "*obstinate* assertor." The Erasmians lift up their hands in horror when they hear the Lutheran declare that he is sure about his position, that he is right and all others wrong. They stigmatize such an attitude as due to stubborn pride and conceit. They cannot bear to have Luther say that his opponents, the assertors of free will, are all wrong and that he, the assertor of *sola gratia,* is absolutely right. "Those men, as far as they asserted 'free will,' were most ignorant of the Sacred Writings." (P. 120.) "Those should rather be selected who have spoken in defense of grace." (P. 101.) How can you say, Luther, that you alone are right? Well, Luther will put it still more strongly. He closes his treatise with this statement: "In this book of mine I have asserted, and still do assert, and *I wish none to become judges but all to yield assent.*" (P. 393.)

---

12) "Es ist fuer Luther sogar ein Anzeichen der Wahrheit einer Lehre, wenn sie 'rumort' oder 'Tumult' macht; sonst waere sie nicht Wahrheit. Beruehmte Stelle in *De Servo Arbitrio.*" (Prof. Preuss of Erlangen. *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kz.,* Oct. 29, 1937, p. 989.)

Let one of us say today that we shall permit no man to revise our teaching and that we demand its unconditional acceptance, and we shall be overwhelmed with fierce denunciations of such intolerable conceit and bigotry. These denunciations would indeed be in place if Luther's assertions were the result of his own observation, investigation, and experience. Judgments based on human intelligence are subject to revision. We realize that where our judgments are backed by nothing more than our intelligence and study, we may be wrong fifty per cent. of the time, perhaps seventy-five per cent. of the time. Our opponent may be right and we wrong. But where our judgment is backed by the clear word of Scripture, where our judgments are simply the judgments of Scripture, there we are right one hundred per cent. of the time, and the opponent is wrong. The opponent indeed may uphold his judgment with the same stubbornness as Luther. But it is not the same stubbornness. One proceeds from the refusal to submit the judgment of conceited reason to the clear teaching of Scripture, the other from the firm conviction of the truth of Scripture, written into the heart by the Holy Ghost. And we are certainly not going to let the fact that men misinterpret Scripture and stubbornly cling to their error shake our reliance on the sure word of Scripture. The Holy Ghost can and does create this assurance in spite of the fact that many, perhaps the majority, reject in a given case the clear testimony of Scripture. We thank God for this assurance.[13] And out of this assurance Luther declared: "If therefore our subject of discussion is to be decided by the judgment of the Scripture, the victory is mine." (P. 382.) "All the gates of hell cannot bring them [the words of Scripture] to nothing." (P. 310.)

Modern theology is dominated by the spirit of doubt and uncertainty, which "believes that nothing ought to be believed with the confidence of settled faith. This incertitude is praised as the becoming posture of a cultured mind and applauded as the attitude of one who has attained a lofty superiority to all prejudice.... However excusable men may be for entertaining definite and certain beliefs about anything else, they cannot be allowed to hold more than provisional and transitory views concerning matters of religious faith." (W. A. Candler, *The Christ and Creed*, p. 29.) That applies also to our modern "conservative" theologians. Here

13) "Here there dare be no uncertainty. The soul demands a sure Archimedian point where it may stand, where faith can find a sure footing, where literary questions cannot disturb the facts, where an inner conviction, a *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum* brings absolute certainty to the soul. Such a sure foundation is to be found only in the Word of God." (Dr. J. C. Mattes, in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Oct., 1937, p. 425.)

we have the great host of the unionists. The soul of unionism is indifference to doctrine. And here we have the great host of those who no longer believe in the inspiration of Scripture. There is not, and there cannot be, anything positive about their teaching. They do not deal in assertions but in "problems," as Dr. W. Laible said: "Ach, dieses 'Es steht geschrieben,' auch das ist veraltet — 'Biblizismus'! . . . Indem man aber die Schrift nicht mehr massgebend sein laesst, hat man die Leuchte Gottes verloren, die einzige Hilfe in der Nacht, in der wir stehen, die einzige Wegweisung auf dem Wege der Kirche. Ist es ein Wunder, wenn die 'Probleme' ungeloest in der Luft wirbeln?" Everything has become problematical, uncertain, because inspiration itself is treated as a "problem." They are telling us: The Bible teaches inspiration, but it does not tell you definitely what inspiration is. — We need to get back to Luther, who taught us to say: "It is written!" It is absolutely true. — The editor of the *Living Church* had protested against promiscuous communion as a *hindrance* to union, and somebody wrote him a letter: "Do we understand that you are dogmatic in your conception of 'Holy Communion'? Do we understand that in the event of a world 'round table' on the subject of church unity you would refuse to budge on your views of Holy Communion to the point of preventing church unity? If you are dogmatic in this matter, just *how* dogmatic?" The editor answered with one brief word: "As DOGMATIC as the Holy Catholic Church." (Dec. 11, 1937.) If Erasmus had asked the "obstinate assertor" Luther: "Just *how* dogmatic are you?" Luther would have answered: "As DOGMATIC as Holy Scripture." We offer no apology for the dogmatic assertions of Luther. We offer no apology for the dogmatism of the Bible. TH. ENGELDER

(To be continued)

Professional Growth in the Study of the Confessions

1

It is well that, when the "Pastor's Professional Growth" series was planned by the editors of the *Theological Monthly*, there was included in it also an article on the minister's professional growth in the study and knowledge of the confessions, both of our Lutheran Church and of other denominations. We state this because since time immemorial there has prevailed in some circles the false and hurtful notion that symbolics makes an extremely tedious study and that, since it is merely a sort of repetition of dogmatics, it ultimately matters very little whether one knows his *Concordia* or not. Comparative symbolics, of course, has usually been re-

garded in a somewhat more favorable light, since a certain amount of novelty and variety attaches to the confessional writings of other churches and a pastor simply cannot get along without knowing what the other churches are teaching.

In a way, perhaps, our ministry must not be criticized too severely for this rather listless attitude toward the confessions. Law students, they tell us, are not particularly attracted by the study of statutes, nor are students of medicine very much elated over the study of *materia medica*. Every science has, so to speak, its uninteresting parts, which must be taken along with the rest. And yet, as the student of medicine can never become an efficient practitioner unless he masters also the so-called dry subjects of his science, so also the student of theology can never become a truly competent pastor unless he thoroughly and zealously studies the somewhat academic and yet also practical subject of Christian confessions. The successful barrister always has a firm and comprehensive grasp of statutory law; its detailed niceties and subtleties, trivialities though often they may seem, he knows with that admirable certainty and distinctiveness which permits him to judge soundly even when his opponent is trying to screen the issue under the heaviest smoke cloud of rhetorical and logical sophistry. It is strange indeed that, when an Einstein insists upon subtilities and hair-splitting distinctions in physics, and a Hughes in law, and a Calmette in bacteriology, these men are honored by the whole world, while that same world takes issue with the minister who contends that confessional distinctions should be emphasized and doctrinal subtilities must be analyzed. The explanation for this we find in the οὐ δέχεται of 1 Cor. 2:14. Far stranger, however, it is that we Christian ministers should be indifferent with respect to the "faith of our fathers" and its preservation in a hostile world. Certainly, if our Church is to remain the faithful witness of Christ which it has been in the past, there must be among our pastors "professional growth" also in the study of the confessions.

2

Whether our own Lutheran Confessions deserve continued study or not depends on what they are *per se* and *of what benefit* they are to us today in this undogmatic age, when creeds quite generally have been relegated to the trash heap. As to the first point, we of Missouri hold neither the historical nor the dogmatical view of our Confessions. By this we mean that in our estimation our Confessions are neither mere relics of a *passé* belief, of no practical significance at all to us today, nor doctrinal norms which independently of Scripture establish the official *corpus doctrinae* of a denomination. In other words, on the point of confessional definition we neither Calvinize nor Romanize; but we accept our Chris-

tian Confessions as a "testimony and declaration" (*Zeugnis und Erklaerung,* Form. of Conc., Epit., 8) of the Christian faith, to which our pious fathers in troubled times were forced by doctrinal controversies that almost destroyed the Church. The symbols constituted their doctrinal challenge to the forces of hell, which had assailed the Church and with the misericorde of false teaching meant to give the death-blow to the almost defeated "body of Christ." But they were more than a heroic challenge; they were the victorious sword by which the enemy was put to rout and, by God's grace, the Church was preserved; for after all is said, the orthodox Confessions are "a comprehensive, unanimously approved summary and form wherein is brought together from God's Word the common doctrine, reduced to a brief compass, which the churches that are of the true Christian religion confess" (Form. of Conc., Thor. Decl., *Trigl.,* p. 849 f.). They are *God's* Word.

So arose the three Ecumenical Creeds, even the *Symbolum Apostolicum,* which was the first challenge of the Christian *baptizandi* to the misbelief of a godless world, the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, the Smalcald Articles, the Formula of Concord, yes, and also Luther's catechisms; for as a church norm they are the challenge of the Lutheran Church over against the devastating errors of Romanism, Calvinism, and Socinianism, or Unitarianism, which today confronts the Lutheran believer in the form of Modernism. Always the orthodox symbols of the Christian Church have been declarations of the Christian faith and, as such, God's own Word, set forth in that particular form in which it best served the paramount purpose of confuting error and defending divine truth. Far be it from us, therefore, that we despise our confessional standards! Whoever contemns the Christian confessions that proclaim the doctrines of Scripture, contemns God Himself, who has given us His Word. Whatever may be feeble or imperfect in their wording or organization (though upon the whole they are better creeds than we could produce today) is certainly of men and must so be acknowledged; but these human, and therefore *in externis* more or less imperfect, testimonies set forth God's unchangeable truth, and that must be sacrosanct to us as "the sanctuary above all sanctuaries, yea, the only one which we Christians know and have and which sanctifies everything" (Large Catechism, Third Commandment, § 91, *Trigl.,* p. 607). But as such should they not move us to continued study and indefatigable research? Dr. Walther endeavored to study the entire *Konkordienbuch* from cover to cover every two years, though perhaps he knew the Lutheran Confessions better than any other theologian of his time. He is said to have expressed the opinion that, if he failed to read the Confessions regularly and systematically, he would become ignorant of

the Lutheran doctrine in its clearest form and expression and lose for himself their devout spirit of Biblical loyalty. Do we need our Confessions less than this great man of God? In Germany the confessional Lutheran groups have recently returned to a new consideration of the Lutheran Confessions, and they are centering their attention on them more than ever men have done since the passing of the great orthodoxy in the eighteenth century. Should we Lutherans of America remain indifferent to the doctrinal values stored up in our glorious Confessions? It seems egregiously unreasonable.

However, as little as we dare to neglect our own confessional standards, just so little, too, may we ignore those of our denominational competitors. To argue on this point at any length would mean to insult the intelligence of our readers; but let us briefly state that, unless we read Roman dogma in its own confession and writings and cease getting our knowledge of Catholic teaching merely from second-hand sources, we are liable not only to do our antichristian opponent the greatest injustice but also by sheer ignorance of the real issues to carry on polemics which beats the air and hurts no one. So also the Reformed confessions, though the Calvinists themselves, in general, do not give them the attention which they deserve, must be studied by us without fail; for these creeds, though differing from one another in more or less nonessential points, teach and defend the errors of Zwingli, Calvin, and other Reformed leaders. Today the danger threatening us through Calvinistic doctrinal influx is doubly great, since in a way we are fighting shoulder to shoulder with Calvinistic Fundamentalists (though each, of course, in his proper camp) to defend against the ever-increasing multitude of Modernists the basic and distinctive differences of the Christian faith, such as the divine inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Christ, His vicarious atonement, salvation by grace, and the hope of life eternal through faith in Christ's blood. But we agree with the Calvinistic Fundamentalists only with regard to the mere general confession of these doctrines. They say: "The Bible is the Word of God," and so do we. But enter more deeply into the dogmatic contents of the article of Bibliology, and Lutherans and Fundamentalists soon find themselves on divergent paths. Just so it is also with the other essentials just named, the deity of Christ, His vicarious atonement, and the like. The "different spirit" of Zwinglianism and Calvinism causes almost in every chapter of Christian doctrine as deep and wide a gulf as that which exists between Lutheranism and Romanism. No indeed; we must take the doctrinal differences between Lutheranism and Reformed Fundamentalism very seriously and study most earnestly all departures from the Biblical and Lutheran doctrine. If the Lutheran Confessions are true state-

ments and declarations of the Christian faith, in perfect harmony with God's Word, all the confessions of Romanism, Calvinism, and Socinianism opposing that Word are declarations of false doctrine, which, whether the error seems great or small, in the end tends to mislead its adherents into everlasting perdition. Where divine truth and human error contend with each other, there is no middle ground, and there can be no neutrality and, of course, also no indifferentism and syncretism. Confessions certainly deserve our careful study, either because they teach and confess God's Word or because they seek to overthrow it. In the one case we ought to be interested in the better understanding of the divine truth and in the other in the preservation of divine truth against human speculation.

3

When the question is asked *of what benefit* the study of our Confessions may be to us as individuals and, collectively, as a communion of believers in, and witness for, Christ, the reply, in the first place, is the same as that given in answer to the query what the detailed and continued study of the Word of God, or the Holy Bible, itself may help us. Luther's excellent words in his Large Catechism (Third Commandment, § 100, *Trigl.*, p. 609) certainly apply also to the study of God's Word as it is set forth in our Christian confessions: "Such is the efficacy of the Word, whenever it is seriously contemplated, heard, and used, that it is bound never to be without fruit but always awakens new understanding, pleasure, and devoutness, and produces a pure heart and pure thoughts. For these words are not inoperative or dead but creative, living words. And even though no other interest or necessity impel us, yet this ought to urge every one thereunto, because thereby the devil is put to flight and driven away, and, besides, this commandment is fulfilled, and this exercise in the Word is more pleasing to God than any work of hypocrisy, however brilliant."

The great Reformer's statement that the efficacious Word of God "always awakens new understanding, pleasure, and devoutness" must claim our attention in a special way this year, when we observe the centenary of the coming of our Saxon Pilgrim Fathers. For an entire century ours has been a privilege which very few Christians in the world have ever enjoyed: we have had God's Word in its truth and purity to guide us in our individual and congregational life both in doctrine and practise. But do we as a Church show spiritual understanding, pleasure, and devoutness (neuen Verstand, Lust und Andacht) in a very remarkable degree? Do we bear witness of God's Word in a measure agreeing with the greatness of the trust with which we have been endowed? Have we proved ourselves a missionary Church more than others which did not have the pure Gospel doctrine?

In his explanation of the Third Commandment Luther writes these most earnest and reproachful words, which, we believe, adequately characterize much of our own ministerial and congregational attitude and activity today: "Likewise those fastidious spirits are to be reproved who, when they have heard a sermon or two, find it tedious and dull" (sind sie es satt und ueberdruessig), "thinking that they know all that well enough and need no more instruction. For just that is the sin which has been hitherto reckoned among mortal sins and is called ἀκηδία, *i. e.*, torpor or satiety, a malignant, dangerous plague, with which the devil bewitches and deceives the hearts of many, that he may surprise us and secretly withdraw God's Word from us" (auf dass er uns uebereile und das Wort Gottes wieder heimlich entziehe).

We do not care to spend too much time on this rather unpleasant subject; nevertheless, if we would honestly examine ourselves before God on this point, we surely would be obliged to confess in His heart-searching presence that more or less we all have proved ourselves "fastidious spirits," who deserve His censure and severe punishment. What a blessing it would be for our Church if the "new understanding, pleasure, and devoutness" of which Luther speaks in His Catechism would be found throughout our denomination among pastors and laity, old and young, in every sphere of Christian life and work! May we seek it in a renewed conscientious study of Scripture and our precious Lutheran Confessions, the choicest fruit of our fathers' faith and loyalty!

A renewed, conscientious study of our Confessions, however, would not only awaken in our circles "a new understanding, pleasure and devoutness," as we have just heard, but in the same measure it would also bless us with that most profitable and necessary spiritual *solidarity* or *cohesiveness,* without which we cannot hope to fight the Lord's battles successfully, as one united, mighty army of God. Error divides, as the modern *Lehrverwirrung,* or confusion of doctrine, among the sectarian churches, which are disloyal to God's Word, abundantly proves; but God's Word unites. Of the first Christians at Jerusalem we read in Scripture: "And all that believed were together and had all things common," Acts 2:44; and again: "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul," Acts 4:32. They kept the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, Eph. 4:3. And this they did because "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers," Acts 2:42. Here was a sacred fellowship, a holy communion, based upon God's Word and confirmed by daily use of the Lord's Supper and prayer, which was wondrously unique. The believers at Jerusalem were perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment,

1 Cor. 1:10. They were one in their one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, Eph. 4:5. They had ecclesiastical union in true, inward, spiritual or Spirit-wrought unity of faith and love.

We, too, have enjoyed this wondrous solidarity of faith and spirit in an exceptional way. In fact, we have become so accustomed to it that we are surprised at the very thought that it might be taken away from us. In method and application, in questions of external management, we of course uphold our Christian liberty and, though guarding against a separatistic, schismatic spirit, do things as circumstances and the furtherance of God's kingdom suggest, always of course within the regulation of the divine Word. But in dogma we are unqualifiedly one, standing four-square upon the whole body of doctrine as it is set forth in Holy Scripture. Will this almost unparalleled spiritual and doctrinal cohesion remain ours in the future? Already there are signs intimating Corinthian faults of division and dissension. We need not expatiate on this matter; let every one here contemplate the situation with a view to remedy and to heal. But the healing of the breach lies only in our common study of God's Word, and that also as it is confessed in its purity in our Confessions. If we retain the truth and spirit of our Confessions, if their love and loyalty to Scripture and its teachings will remain ours, then we may defy Satan's attempts to set at variance brother against brother and church against church. Then we will readily subject our personal interests to the common good and in brotherly love seek to strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die, Rev. 3:2. Let us, then, study our Confessions for continued and yet greater spiritual solidarity or fellowship in the Lord's Word and work. We owe it to our high spiritual leadership to know thoroughly, and be able to give at all times and in every way a good account of, our Confessions.

But what has just been said is true also of spiritual *Anschluss.* The study of God's Word, set forth in our Confession, will foster and cement not only solidarity, but also true Christian affiliation; and by this we mean communion *ad extra,* while solidarity represents communion *ad intra.* Today Lutheran synods more than ever before realize the serious drawbacks of denominational solitariness. It is held that solidarity *ad intra* is not sufficient; *Anschluss ad extra* is also highly desirable. Now, let us for the moment leave out of consideration whether or not God may grant us by grace that Lutheran union which for years has been sought so eagerly both in our own country and abroad. Let us suppose that also in the future Lutheranism will not be united outwardly but will be split into small churches, or denominations. But what of this if the individual loyal Lutheran groups have true, inward or spiritual

fellowship with all the thousands within the general Lutheran pale who are joined together inwardly by the spirit and truth of our Lutheran Confessions? Is not, after all, that which is inward greater than that which is external? Are we, after all, not working for the increase of the *communio sanctorum*, the *ecclesia invisibilis*, rather than for that of an *ecclesia visibilis à la* Ritschl or Rome? The Lutheran believer, though greatly desiring outward union with confessing Christian groups bearing the same name, is not greatly perturbed if outward affiliation in church union is not realized. He is more concerned with the spiritual *Anschluss* of faith, the inward communion, which comes from diligent study and unqualified acceptance of God's Word, and this especially, too, as the Word is presented in our Confessions. We are sure that, if for one year all the eighty million Lutherans (or however many or few there may be in the world) would diligently, prayerfully, and open-heartedly study the *Concordia* and consecrate themselves to the acceptance and confession of the doctrines laid down therein, to the utter suppression of all Pelagianistic, Romanistic, and Calvinistic leaven that has found its way into their midst, there would be such a remarkable agreement in faith and brotherly love that a United Lutheran Church of the World would soon be the outward result of the inward faith-fellowship.

And so, as another fruit and blessing of the consecrated study of our Confessions, we must mention also the *unio ad extra* which it would produce. Very soon, we believe, the inward fellowship of faith engendered by the study of our Confessions would result in the drawing together of the various Lutheran confessional groups. From that point of view especially we desire a universal, earnest study of our Confessions among all Lutherans throughout the world at this time. Could such a merger as a United Lutheran Church of the World be achieved, what a power it would constitute against Romanism, Calvinism, and Modernism! Today the ecumenical character of confessional Lutheranism is quite generally recognized. True Lutheranism is not sectarian, but ecumenical. Wherever church groups have found it necessary to separate from Lutheranism, it was because some sectarian leaven brought about the inward breach of the faith-fellowship. So Romanism is sectarian; so Calvinism is sectarian; so Socinianism is sectarian; so fanaticism in every form is sectarian; so every other separatistic ism is sectarian. Sectarianism is departure from God's Word, while Lutheranism in its real confessional attitude is adherence to God's Word. That is a boast, but a glorious boast, because it is a glorying in the Lord Jesus Christ, whose Word is our supreme norm of faith and life and our joy and glory. Now, then, if the Lutheran Confessions (which by their very nature are altogether ecumenical just because

they are thoroughly Scriptural) would be universally studied, believed, and accepted by all Lutheran groups, there would be brought about what the so-called Lutheran world conventions can never bring about if they allow sectarianism to remain and destroy, namely, a spiritually united Lutheran Church truly loyal to Scripture in faith and profession. Alas, because of the perverseness, unbelief, and apostasy of fallen human nature we never dare hope that such a united Lutheran Church will be realized; but if it is not realized, it is not because such a union is theoretically impossible but because practically sectarian, unscriptural considerations thwart the unifying influences of God's inwardly uniting Gospel. At any rate, as eagerly as we desire the boon of outward church union, so eagerly, in the interest of such union, let us study God's precious Word in the truly glorious Confessions of our Church.

Lastly, just as the study of God's Word in our Confessions, unless prevented by Satan and our perverse flesh, produces inward and outward fellowship among Christian believers, so also it bestows that sober-mindedness which, rooted in God's Word, repudiates every kind of fanaticism and enthusiasm that threaten to invade our Church. Of enthusiasm we have every reason to beware today, when "sheer enthusiasm" has gained for itself a place in almost every existing denomination. Briefly expressed, enthusiasm is a going beyond God's Word; and enthusiasm goes beyond God's Word in trying to produce those results which only God's Word itself can accomplish. Enthusiasm therefore is rejection of God's Word. Calvinism, Romanism, and Unitarianism are all enthusiastic in their very nature, just as they are also sectarian in their nature; for enthusiasm and sectarianism go hand in hand, just as in the final analysis they are one. However, enthusiasm does not always appear in the crude form in which it shows itself among some of the lower sects of our religious world. Holy Rollerism is a very boorish form of enthusiasm and so very offensive; but it is doubtful whether really it is more dangerous than Calvinistic and Arminianistic revivalism or Romanistic High-churchism. Here we must beware of the "little leaven" that leaveneth the whole lump; and what will aid us very greatly in this, what will keep us sober and steadfast in the divine truth, is, we believe, the very study of our Confessions, which because of their perfect loyalty to God's Word are the very best antidote against all forms of enthusiasm, both crude and insidious. Also on this point we confine ourselves to only the most necessary principles, since the matter is so obvious that a more detailed discussion is quite unnecessary. But, to speak in review, if we desire the true spiritual understanding, pleasure, and devoutness in the Lord's work and, besides this, true solidarity within our Church and true,

abiding Christian fellowship with other Christians, and in particular with Lutherans not yet joined to us by church affiliation, together with that sacred sober-mindedness which spurns every form and outgrowth of sectarianism and enthusiasm, then we must zealously study God's Word as it is set forth in our Confessions; for there we have the divine means by which all these blessings may be secured, unless, of course, in sheer unbelief and folly we repudiate God's Word and follow our own perverse wisdom of the flesh.

4

However, the question still remains regarding the *manner* in which our Confessions may best be studied. Here, of course, much depends on the personal work method of the individual pastor. Very few of us do our work in precisely the same way, and hence what may help the one may hurt the other. In the end, the only thing that really matters is that the study of the Confessions be actually, regularly, and systematically attended to. And here again it is necessary that a beginning be made, and such a beginning indeed as contemplates persistent continuation to the "bitter end"; for any work irregularly and desultorily executed is as good as useless. Under the circumstances prevailing in most pastoral charges, it may be best for the minister to set aside each day a certain amount of time (and not too much of that either; say about an hour or so) for the perusal of our *Concordia Triglotta.* Let him begin in front with the excellent historical Introductions by Dr. F. Bente and then read, with pencil in hand to underline and note summaries, paragraph after paragraph until a certain part or book is finished. Then let him sum up in outlines what that book teaches, and let him so arrange his material that he may utilize it in his sermons or catechism instruction, also, of course, in conference papers, and the like. Such private, persistent study of the Confessions is absolutely necessary, and there is nothing else that can take its place. If the study should appear "stale" to us at times, let us remember the glorious contents of the Confessions, the stress of the times under which they were produced, and the practical values of the doctrines here presented and defended.

The careful study of the *Concordia Triglotta,* from beginning to end (and let no one slight what has been added in the rear by way of an appendix), with proper underlining and marginal summary and note work, will take about one whole year, provided the pastor can devote to it an hour or a little more a day (excepting, of course, Sundays and other preaching or festival days). But after he has covered the whole ground in this thorough way, he will have acquired so large an amount of practical, every day usable theology that he will not like to ignore the *Concordia* as he prepares for his sermons, instruction lessons, conference papers,

periodical articles, and so forth. He may then in particular make use of the fine comprehensive and detailed Index in the rear of the book and study the heads of doctrine suggested by his special pastoral work *topically*. To aid themselves in this work, some pastors have drawn up for themselves concordances of passages, so that they may be able to find valuable passages of their choice without delay. Of course, very important passages that bear on doctrines to be daily applied, such as justification by faith, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the like, ought to be memorized; for while our Confessions can never take the place of the Bible, the *norma normans*, they, as the *norma normata*, show what is regarded by Lutheranism as Bible doctrine and so also are worthy of frequent quotation [their quotation at times even becoming necessary] both in the pulpit and in instruction periods.

And here we recommend that the minister should endeavor to acquaint his young and old parishioners with the Confessions. This may be done in sermons, but it is best accomplished in special classes. Of our Confessions three especially may be well used for popular instruction, namely, the Augsburg Confession, its history and doctrine; Luther's Large Catechism, in topical presentation; and the Epitome of the Formula of Concord. If our laity would master the contents of these three precious books, they certainly would be much better indoctrinated than they are now, when so many of our adults receive hardly any doctrinal instruction outside the sermon on Sunday. That the study of these three books appeals to our laity the writer himself has experienced time and again when he made them the topics for class study in Sunday-school or congregational work.

But above all, our pastors' and teachers' conferences must take up the study of our Confessions. Our Confessions present, in the main, central doctrines, and indeed those fundamental teachings which at all times are more or less in controversy. The doctrines of the Augsburg Confession and of the Formula of Concord, and of course also those of the Smalcald Articles and the other confessional writings, are of such tremendous importance that we simply must not ignore them when we meet as brethren in conference to gain new strength and inspiration for our work. We really cannot preach and testify rightly unless we are thoroughly conversant with these great doctrines which the Book of Concord so forcibly emphasizes. Loyalty here compels us to play fair with God, who has placed upon us the sacred obligation to preach His Word in its truth and purity. Unless we study that Word and preach it to the full extent of its deep meaning and wide application, we do not faithfully discharge the holy office which by grace we have received of God. The question is: Are we going to be faithful? Are we going to love God's Word as our fathers have loved it? Upon our reply

to these questions depends our future weal or woe, whether as a Church we shall progress and triumph or whether ultimately we shall go down in doctrinal defeat.

It is very perturbing at times to notice how the spirit of indifferentism with respect to doctrine is slowly but steadily increasing in our circles. At conferences and synodical conventions the call is for practical discussions rather than for doctrinal presentations. And what is worse still is that the cry is for mechanical "short-cut" methods that simplify and reduce the hard labor which naturally the office of the Christian ministry imposes upon both pastors and elders. By practical "short-cut" methods we desire to enlarge our church and Communion attendance, our Christian giving, our missionary activities, our instruction of young and old catechumens, and the like. Our patterns seem to be the simplified, practical factory methods of the enormous industrial or commercial enterprises of our time; but we forget that there is a vast difference between the work of big business and that of the Church. The Church indeed should be characterized by activity, and by plenty of it; but this activity must be divinely motivated, directed, and sustained through the study and application of God's Word. If we shall let up on God's Word and its study, God will surely let up on us and cease blessing us; for whatever blessings God bestows upon us as a Church, He mediates to us only by means of His Word. On the contrary, if we diligently and prayerfully study the Word of God as it is set forth to us in Scripture and our Lutheran Confessions, we may face the future without fear; for our consecrated pastors, deeply rooted in God's Word, will do their important work with absolute doctrinal certainty, perform their preaching and teaching ministry with true brotherly uniformity in presentation and expressions, and will, lastly, evince in all their pastoral and missionary dealings that valuable Christian sobermindedness which will keep Lutheranism free from the taint and mold of rationalism, enthusiasm, and sectarianism.

May God in His mercy preserve to us a studious *ministerium!*

J. Theodore Mueller

Kleine Danielſtudien

In den erſten ſechs Nummern des vorigen Jahrgangs dieſer Zeitſchrift haben wir ſechs kleine Heſekielſtudien veröffentlicht. Der Grund dafür war, daß dieſes Buch, eine der größten und wunderbarſten prophetiſchen Schriften des Alten Teſtaments, aber zugleich eins der ſchwierigeren Bücher der Heiligen Schrift, beſondere Gottesgedanken enthält, die ſein Studium für den Theologen ſehr nützlich und wertvoll machen, und daß andererſeits die Schwärmer alter und neuer Zeit ſich gerade auch mit

dieſem Buche beſchäftigt haben, um ihre eigenen verkehrten und törichten Gedanken mit der Schrift zu decken. Dieſe ſechs Studien haben uns eine Anzahl Briefe eingetragen. Dieſe Zuſchriften bewegen uns, einen andern Propheten in ſolchen kleinen, abgerundeten Studien vorzuführen und damit zugleich wieder dem für alle jungen und alten Theologen unentbehrlichen, unabläſſigen Schriftſtudium etwas zu dienen zu ſuchen. Und unſere Wahl fällt diesmal auf den Propheten Daniel. Einmal enthält auch dieſes Buch ganz große, wunderbare Gottesgedanken über Gottes Reich und Kirche, ſchildert tatſächlich, was ſchon Luther erkannt hat, wie im Fluge den Gang der Welt- und Kirchengeſchichte von Daniels Zeit an bis zum Ende aller Tage. Der Reformator bemerkt nämlich einmal in ſeinen Tiſchreden: „Die Weisſagung Daniels iſt eine feine Chronik, geht bis ans Ende der Welt, weil deutlich das Reich des Antichriſts und des Türken ausgedrückt iſt.“ [1] Das Buch Daniels iſt aber auch im beſonderen Sinne eine Troſtſchrift, gerade wie die Offenbarung St. Johannis von Walther ganz mit Recht „das köſtliche Chriſten- und Kirchentroſtbuch“ genannt wurde.[2] Deshalb ſchrieb auch Luther, als er den Daniel überſetzte, am 25. Februar 1530 an Nikolaus Hausmann: „Jetzt bereiten wir den Daniel für den Druck zu zum Troſte für dieſe letzte Zeit“,[3] und fügte darum auch dieſer Überſetzung eine ſehr leſenswerte, ganz treffliche Auslegung des elften und zwölften Kapitels bei, der die erſte vollſtändige deutſche Ausgabe den Titel gab „Das zwelffte Capitel Danielis, mit der Auslegung D. Martini Lutheri, zu dieſen fehrlichen Zeiten ſeer nützlich und tröſtlich zu leſen“.[4]

Sodann hat das Buch Daniel auch beſondere Bedeutung für das Neue Teſtament. Die gewöhnliche Selbſtbezeichnung des Heilandes, die nicht weniger als einundachtzigmal im Neuen Teſtament vorkommt, „Menſchenſohn“, iſt, wie wir ſpäter ſehen werden, aus Dan. 7, 13 genommen. Und das ganze Buch der Offenbarung ruht wie zum Teil auf Heſekiel, ſo noch mehr auf Daniel wie überhaupt alle eſchatologiſchen Ausführungen des Neuen Teſtaments. Daniels Buch hat freilich auch beſondere Schwierigkeiten und iſt darum wieder eins der Bücher der Heiligen Schrift, die von den Schwärmern gemißbraucht werden und in denen vorwitzige Geiſter namentlich in aufgeregten Zeiten ihre Hoffnungen und Befürchtungen finden wollen. Jedermann weiß, wie die Schwärmer mit Vorliebe ſich damit befaſſen, wer das kleine Horn und der große König ſei, und daß namentlich die Zahlen in Daniel, die darin allerdings eine Rolle ſpielen, in willkürlicher Weiſe berechnet und auf Ereigniſſe in der Kirche und in der Welt gedeutet werden. Und endlich iſt das Buch Daniel auch eins der bibliſchen Bücher, die wegen ihres Inhalts beſonders von der modernen Bibelkritik angegriffen werden, ſo daß der auf dem Gebiete des Alten Teſtaments gelehrte anglikaniſche Theolog Puſey mit Recht ſagen konnte: “The Book of Daniel is especially fitted

1) St. Louiſer Ausg. **XXII**, 1600.
2) Lehre und Wehre, 2, 204.
3) **XXIa**, 1416.
4) **VI**, 892.

to be a battle-field between faith and unbelief. . . . It is either divine or an imposture."[5] Und ſchon Hengſtenberg, der verdienſtvolle Ausleger und Apologet des Alten Teſtaments, hat zu ſeiner Zeit geſagt, daß die Leugnung der Echtheit des Buches Daniel vom Standpunkt der Gegner der Offenbarung aus „eine durchaus notwendige" ſei. „Die Wunder und Weisſagungen des Buches überſteigen ſo ſehr den gewöhnlichen Naturlauf, daß die Anerkennung der Echtheit des Daniel und die Anerkennung der offenbarten Religion unzertrennlich verbunden ſind."[6]

Selbſtverſtändlich können wir auch bei Daniel wie ſchon bei Heſekiel nur eine Auswahl für unſere kleinen Studien treffen wegen der Raumbeſchränkung in einer Zeitſchrift. Das Buch hat einen großen und reichen Inhalt, und für die nicht behandelten Punkte müſſen wir den Leſer auf Kommentare wie Martin Geier in der älteren Zeit und Keil und Kliefoth in neuerer Zeit und andere Werke, die wir im Verlaufe dieſer Studien nennen werden, verweiſen. Wir werden uns wieder vorausſichtlich auf ſechs Artikel beſchränken, die etwa die folgenden Überſchriften tragen werden: 1. Daniels Perſon; 2. Daniels Buch; 3. Der Wahnſinn des Großkönigs und die Handſchrift an der Wand, Kap. 4 und 5; 4. Die vier Weltreiche und das Gottesreich, Kap. 7 und 8; 5. Der Menſchenſohn, Kap. 7, 13. 14; 6. Die letzten Geſichte Daniels, Kap. 9–12.

1. Daniels Perſon

Schon der Name des Propheten Daniel iſt beachtenswert. Er trägt eben einen hochbedeutſamen Namen wie alle die großen Männer des Volkes Gottes im Alten Teſtament, bedeutſam für ſeine Perſon und für das Volk, unter dem er wirkt. Der Name des Jeſaja bedeutet „Heil iſt (oder ſchafft) Jehovah", und Jeſaja hat wie kein anderer das Heil Gottes in dem zukünftigen Meſſias verkündigt. Der Name Jeremia bedeutet „Der HErr wirft oder wirft hin", und Jeremia hat angekündigt und dann auch berichtet, wie Gott ſein Volk zu Boden geworfen hat. Der Name Heſekiel bedeutet „Gott iſt ſtark", und ſein Wirken und ſein Buch zeigen die alles überwältigende Stärke Gottes. Der Name Daniel bedeutet „Mein Richter iſt Gott", und dieſer Name hat ſich in Daniels ganzem Leben bewahrheitet. Gott iſt ſein Richter. Das bewahrt ihn vor Menſchenfurcht und Menſchengefälligkeit; das erhält ihn in ſeiner ſtrengen Gewiſſenhaftigkeit und Frömmigkeit, ſo daß er dem väterlichen Geſetze treu bleibt und es nicht übertritt, nicht teilnimmt an dem fremden und falſchen Gottesdienſt, keine Scheu hat, einem Nebukadnezar, einem Belſazer und einem Darius die Wahrheit zu bezeugen. Immer lebt in ihm das Bewußtſein: Gott iſt mein Richter.

---

5) Zitiert von Behrmann in Nowacks „Handkommentar zum Alten Teſtament", S. XLVII.

6) Beiträge zur Einleitung ins Alte Teſtament. Erſter Band: Die Authentie des Daniel und die Integrität des Sacharjah, S. 4.

über seine Familie hören wir nichts Näheres, wie überhaupt die Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Glieder bei diesem Propheten zurücktritt aus Gründen, die wir bald erkennen werden. Wir wissen nur, daß er von vornehmem, vielleicht königlichem Geschlechte war; denn Nebukadnezar gebot seinem obersten Kämmerer oder Oberhofmarschall, "the master of his eunuchs", ausdrücklich, er solle aus den Kindern Israel solche wählen, die „vom königlichen Stamm und Herrenkinder" seien, Knaben, die nicht gebrechlich seien, sondern schöne, kluge und verständige Knaben, geschickt, zu dienen am königlichen Hofe und zu lernen chaldäische Sprache und Schrift, Kap. 1, 3. 4. Und einer dieser vornehmen Knaben war Daniel. Das stimmt auch mit der ganzen Weise der orientalischen Herrscher, die gern gerade Königskinder, die Söhne und Verwandten besiegter Könige, zu ihrem Hofdienst bestimmten. Vgl. Neh. 2, 1. 3.

Aus Daniels Geschichte, die er in seinem Buche aufgezeichnet hat, erfahren wir sodann, daß er die ganze Zeit der babylonischen Gefangenschaft durchlebt hat. Er wurde am Anfang des Exils, als Nebukadnezar bei einem seiner Heereszüge Jerusalem zum erstenmal eroberte, im Jahre 606 oder 605, als Jüngling nach Babel weggeführt und in die Schule gegeben und zum Hofdienst vorgebildet. Er hat dann die ganze Dauer des Exils im Morgenland zugebracht, Kap. 1, 21; denn das letzte Datum, das wir in seinem Buche finden, ist das dritte Jahr des Cyrus, Kap. 10, 1, der in seinem ersten Jahre als Großkönig, 536, den Juden die Erlaubnis gab, nach Jerusalem zurückzukehren und dort den Tempel zu bauen, 2 Chron. 36, 22. 23; Esra 1, 1–3. So hat also Daniel wenigstens siebzig Jahre im Morgenlande unter sehr verschiedenen Königen und in sehr verschiedenen Verhältnissen zugebracht, ist auch, soweit wir wissen, nie wieder nach Jerusalem zurückgekehrt, sondern im Morgenland geblieben; weshalb, können wir freilich nur vermuten. Aber diese Vermutung liegt nahe, daß er nämlich mit seinen Fähigkeiten und in seiner hervorragenden Stellung seinem Volke in der Fremde mehr dienen konnte, als wenn er nach Jerusalem zurückgekehrt wäre. Er war ja auch, wie wir später noch genauer erkennen werden, nicht eigentlich ein Prophet für sein Volk, wie Jesaja, Jeremia und Hesekiel, sondern Staatsbeamter in den großen Weltmonarchien, der gerade als ein solcher Beamter sowohl seinem Volke als auch dem Reiche Gottes überhaupt gerade in dieser Zeit mehr nützen konnte, als wenn er auf eine Tätigkeit unter seinem Volke beschränkt gewesen wäre. Berichtet doch auch eine sonst freilich unverbürgte jüdische Tradition, daß Daniel der menschliche Urheber des Befehls des Cyrus betreffs der Rückkehr der Juden und des Tempelbaus gewesen sei. Er habe dem Cyrus die bekannten Weissagungen Jes. 44 und 45 vorgelesen, wo dieser mit Namen genannt, seine Siegeslaufbahn geschildert und auch dies angekündigt wird, daß er zu Jerusalem sagen werde: „Sei gebauet" und zum Tempel: „Sei gegründet", Kap. 44, 28. So hat Daniel ein langes Leben gehabt; denn wenn er siebzig Jahre im Exil war und dann noch bis ins dritte Jahr

des Cyrus lebte und doch bei seiner Wegführung ein יֶלֶד war, ein Knabe oder Jüngling von 17 bis 20 Jahren, Kap. 1, 4. 6. 10. 13. 15, so wird er ein Alter von mindestens neunzig Jahren erreicht haben. Zwischen Kap. 1, 21 und 10, 1 besteht keinerlei Widerspruch. Einmal heißt es an der ersteren Stelle überhaupt nicht „lebte", sondern nur „war", יְהִי, continued; vor allem aber gibt das „bis", unto, עַד, wie das griechische ἕως, das lateinische ad, das deutsche „bis", das englische till häufig nur den terminus ad quem an, ohne anzudeuten, was hinter diesem terminus liegt. Kap. 1, 21 soll nur besagen, daß Daniel während der ganzen Dauer des Exils im Morgenland war.

Und dies sein ganzes langes Leben ist reich an Wundern der göttlichen Macht und Gnade, ein Vorbild ohnegleichen für jung und alt, ein Exempel, das jeder Prediger und Lehrer beim Unterricht in der biblischen Geschichte oder Bibelstunde seinen Kindern und jungen Leuten ans Herz legen wird. Wir brauchen nur an das 1. Kapitel zu erinnern, wo Gott den Daniel am Hofe bewahrte und Segen und Gedeihen zu seiner leiblichen Erhaltung und zu seinem Studium gab; an das 2. Kapitel, wo er dem Nebukadnezar den von diesem vergessenen Traum über das Bild von den vier Weltmonarchien sagte und erklärte; an das 4. Kapitel, wo er demselben Machthaber kühn einen andern, für diesen stolzen König geradezu verhängnisvollen Traum deutete und erklärte, daß er wie ein Tier des Feldes sein würde; an das 5. Kapitel, wo er dem Wüstling Belsazer die merkwürdige Inschrift an der Wand „Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin" deutete und erklärte; an das 6. Kapitel, wo er wegen seiner Frömmigkeit von dem König Darius in den Löwengraben geworfen, aber wunderbar von Gott beschützt wurde. Denken wir dann ferner an die wunderbaren Gesichte, die ihm vom 7. bis zum 12. Kapitel zuteil wurden, die einzigartig dastehen im Alten Testament und wie ein Vorspiel zur Offenbarung St. Johannis sind — aber auch diese Visionen zeugen von Gottes Macht und Gnade. Und wie bei allen diesen Vorkommnissen Daniels strenge Gewissenhaftigkeit und lautere Frömmigkeit hervorleuchtete, die ihn auch das Geringste vermeiden ließ, was wider Gottes Wort und sein Gewissen war, die seinen heidnischen Speisen und die abgöttische Verehrung der Großkönige, so zeigt er in seiner ganzen Wirksamkeit auch große Weisheit. Die Bibel selbst hebt an den paar Stellen, in denen Daniel außerhalb seines eigenen Buches erwähnt wird, gerade diese Weisheit hervor. Hesekiel, sein älterer Zeitgenosse, sagt zweimal, daß, wenn auch die drei Männer Noah, der Prediger der Gerechtigkeit zur Zeit der Sintflut, Hiob, der geduldige Kreuzträger der größten leiblichen und geistlichen Leiden, und Daniel im Lande Juda wären, so würden sie allein ihre eigene Seele erretten durch ihre Gerechtigkeit, würden aber den Untergang des Landes nicht aufhalten können, Hesek. 14, 14. 20. An einer andern Stelle redet Gott durch Hesekiel zu dem stolzen Fürsten von Tyrus, der berühmten See- und Handelsstadt des Altertums, rühmt die Weisheit Daniels und hält ihm

vor: „Siehe, du hältst dich für klüger denn Daniel, daß dir nichts verborgen sei", Kap. 28, 3. Diese Gerechtigkeit und Weisheit, die schon in jugendlichem Alter bei Daniel hervortrat, wurde auch öffentlich anerkannt, so daß Nebukadnezar selbst in allen Sachen, über die er ihn befragte, ihn und seine Freunde zehnmal klüger und verständiger erfand als alle Sternseher und Weisen in seinem ganzen Reiche, Kap. 1, 20. Das ist nicht übertriebenes Eigenlob auf seiten Daniels, sondern Wahrheit, die Gottes Gnade und Gabe verherrlicht.

Diese Weisheit Daniels zeigte sich besonders in der wunderbaren Gabe der Traumdeutung. Nicht nur hat er dem Nebukadnezar zwei inhaltschwere Träume gedeutet, den einen von dem großen Bild und den andern von seinem Wahnsinn, sondern auch die Visionen über die Reiche der Welt und das Reich des Messias hat Daniel zum Teil im Traum empfangen und durch den Geist Gottes, der in ihm war, verstanden und erklärt, Kap. 7, 1. Er ist in dieser Hinsicht in Wahrheit ein zweiter Joseph. Was Joseph für den König Pharao und das ganze Land Ägypten und vor allem für sein Volk war, das war Daniel für Nebukadnezar und das ganze Land Babylonien und namentlich auch für seine eigenen Volksgenossen. Die Parallele zwischen Joseph und Daniel ist so überraschend und stark, daß sie beide auch von ihrem Herrscher einen neuen Namen bekommen, weshalb törichte Bibelkritiker in der Geschichte Daniels nur ein Duplikat der Josephgeschichte erkennen und darum ihre Geschichtlichkeit bezweifeln wollten. Joseph wurde von Pharao genannt Zaphnath-Paneach, was Luther mit „heimlicher Rat" übersetzt hat, die englischen Bibeln unübersetzt beibehalten haben, das aber wörtlich „Heil der Welt" oder wohl richtiger „Erhalter des Lebens" heißt, 1 Mos. 41, 45; und Daniel wird von Nebukadnezar oder vielmehr von dessen Bevollmächtigtem und Kämmerer Aspenas genannt Beltsazar, **Belteshazzar**, babylonisch **Balat-sharusur**, das heißt, „sein Leben", nämlich das Leben des Königs, „schirme", **protect his life**, Kap. 1, 7; 2, 26; 5, 12. Das war ein Hinweis darauf, daß Daniel in seiner amtlichen Stellung am Hofe gerade auch den König beschützen sollte.

Aber immer muß bei der Betrachtung des Lebens und Wirkens Daniels im Auge behalten werden, daß er kein Prophet für sein Volk im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes war, sondern eben ein hoher Beamter der Weltmonarchien. Darum steht auch sein Buch bei den Juden nicht unter den Propheten, sondern im dritten Teile des hebräischen Alten Testaments, unter den sogenannten כְּתוּבִים, ἁγιόγραφα, oder heiligen Schriften. Daniel ist kein Prophet im engeren technischen Sinn des Wortes, sondern nur im weiteren Sinn. Er kann aber darum in diesem weiteren Sinne auch mit Recht ein Prophet genannt werden, wie der Heiland selbst Matth. 24, 15; Mark. 13, 14 ihn so bezeichnet, gerade wie in der Pfingstpredigt St. Petri auch David ein Prophet genannt wird, Apost. 2, 30; aber David war eigentlich König, und sein Buch steht darum auch nicht unter den prophetischen Büchern, sondern ebenfalls

unter den Hagiographen. Mit Recht heben jedoch schon alte Ausleger hervor, daß, wenn Daniel auch nicht das Amt eines Propheten gehabt habe, so doch die Gabe eines Propheten.[7] Luther hat darum mit gutem Grund den Daniel aus den Hagiographen herausgenommen, und ebenso wie die englische Bibel ihn zwischen Hesekiel und Hosea gestellt; und wir bezeichnen nach Luthers Vorgang Daniel mit Recht als einen „großen" Propheten, sowohl wegen seines Umfangs als auch und hauptsächlich wegen seines großen Inhalts. Luther geht so weit, daß er den Daniel gleich neben Jesaja stellt und diese beiden für die größten Propheten des Alten Testaments erklärt, „die zwei fürtrefflichsten Propheten vor den andern allen".[8] Und ein andermal sagt er von Daniels Buch: „Es ist ein königlich und fürstlich Buch. Die Historien rühmen den großen Alexander, daß er den Poeten Homerum habe immer bei sich gehabt und des Nachts unter sein Haupt gelegt und darauf geschlafen. Wieviel billiger wäre es, daß solche und noch größere Ehre diesem Daniel geschähe von allen Königen und Fürsten, daß er nicht allein unter ihr Haupt, sondern in ihr Herz gelegt würde, weil er wohl anderes und Höheres lehrt, denn Homerus hat tun können."[9] Und von der praktischen Bedeutung der Geschichte Daniels sagt der Reformator: „Also ist Daniels Leben nichts anderes denn ein feiner, reiner Spiegel, darinnen man sieht des Glaubens Kampf und Sieg durch Gottes Gnade wider alle Teufel und Menschen und seine große Frucht und Nutzen, den er durch Geduld und Kreuz schaffet beide vor Gott und der Welt."[10] Aber weil Daniel kein Prophet im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes war, so finden wir auch bei ihm keinen solchen Inhalt, wie wir ihn bei den andern Propheten wahrnehmen. Diese nehmen immer Bezug auf die Zustände und Schicksale ihres Volkes und flechten die Geschichte des Volkes, die sich in ihren Tagen zuträgt, in ihre prophetischen Reden ein; aber Daniel verfährt ganz anders. Nur am Anfang hören wir etwas davon, daß Nebukadnezar nach Jerusalem kam, die Stadt belagerte und eroberte, den König Jojakim tributpflichtig machte, eine Anzahl der heiligen Gefäße aus dem Hause Gottes nach Babel in seines Götzen Haus brachte und daß er, wie schon erwähnt, vornehme Knaben und Jünglinge nach Babel wegführen ließ für den Dienst am Hofe. Aber sonst lesen wir in Daniels Buch nichts von der Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes und der heiligen Stadt Jerusalem, sondern nur andeutungsweise wird im 6. Kapitel hervorgehoben, daß Daniel in seinem Sommerhause offene Fenster nach Jerusalem hin hatte und dort seinen Gottesdienst verrichtete, V. 10; und

---

7) Hengstenberg in seinen obenerwähnten „Beiträgen", S. 28, zitiert aus des holländischen Theologen Witsius *Miscellanea Sacra:* **„Distingui in prophetis potest *donum*, quod et privatis contigit et in revelatione rerum arcanarum consistit, et *munus*, quod extraordinaria in ecclesia functio erat certarum quarundam personarum speciali vocatione divina eo destinatarum."**

8) Erlanger Ausgabe 62, 132.

9) VI, 895.

10) Zitiert im 18. Synodalbericht des Kansas-Distrikts 1913, S. 60.

im 9. Kapitel wird erzählt, daß er in der Schrift des Propheten Jeremia forſchte, dabei auf die Zahl der Jahre merkte, daß Jeruſalem ſollte ſiebzig Jahre wüſte liegen und deshalb Gott in einem brünſtigen Gebet um das Ende der Gefangenſchaft anflehte, V. 2. 3. Ebenſo findet ſich in dem Buche keine Erwähnung des Ediktes des Cyrus und der Rückkehr der Juden, kein Wort vom Anfang des Tempelbaus, keine Nennung jüdiſcher Perſönlichkeiten, etwa Joſuas und Serubabels, der Anführer der Juden beim Zug in die Heimat. Nur Daniels drei Freunde, die eben auch in die Geſchichte des Weltreichs hineinkommen, werden genannt: Hananja, Miſael und Sacharja mit ihren babyloniſchen Namen Sadrach, Meſach und Abednego, Kap. 1, 6. 7. Daniel hat eben einen ganz andern Zweck und Geſichtspunkt. Als Staatsbeamter redet er von den großen Weltreichen, in deren Mitte er lebt und denen nach Gottes heilſamer Abſicht das jüdiſche Volk zeitweilig unterworfen war. Aber gerade damit füllt er auch in hochbedeutſamer Weiſe eine Lücke in der heiligen Geſchichte aus. Über das jüdiſche Volk in dieſer Zeit erfahren wir das Nötige in andern Schriften, im zweiten Königs- und im zweiten Chronikbuch, bei Jeremia und Heſekiel, bei Esra, Nehemia und Eſther. Aber Daniel ſchildert uns ſeinem Zwecke und Plane gemäß die große, bedeutungsvolle Zeit, in der er lebt, den Höhepunkt und Niedergang der babyloniſchen Weltmonarchie und das Aufkommen des mediſch-perſiſchen Weltreichs. Und in ſeinen Viſionen ſieht er dann, wie wir noch ins Auge faſſen werden, die griechiſch-mazedoniſche Weltmonarchie und das große römiſche Reich, und über den Trümmern all der mächtigen Reiche der Alten Welt erhebt ſich das ewige Reich Chriſti, das nicht vergehen wird, ſondern bleiben wird bis an das Ende der Tage, bis zur Vollendung, Kap. 2, 44; 7, 13. 14.

Schon aus dem Amte, das Daniel innehatte, und aus der Bedeutung, die er darin gewann, können wir ſchließen, daß er eine große, gewaltige, eindrucksvolle Perſönlichkeit geweſen ſein muß; und dies wird auch durch das genauere Studium ſeines Buches vollauf beſtätigt. Er genoß nicht bloß, wie die beiden oben angeführten kurzen Stellen bei Heſekiel andeuten, unter ſeinen eigenen Volksgenoſſen hohes Anſehen wegen ſeiner Gerechtigkeit und Weisheit, ſondern er machte auch nachhaltigen Eindruck auf ſehr verſchiedene Großkönige. Wir begegnen dem deſpotiſchen Nebukadnezar, unter dem das Reich Babel ſeine letzte Renaiſſance erlebte. Das war ein großer, ſtarker Herrſcher, der mit ſeinem Vater Nabopolaſſar in der kurzen Zeit von dreißig Jahren ſich ganz Vorderaſien unterwarf, worum die Aſſyrier jahrhundertelang gerungen hatten. Aber dieſer gewaltige Weltherrſcher kommt durch Daniels Dienſt unter göttlichen Einfluß; er wird Gottes Knecht, inſofern ihm Gott die Herrſchaft über die weſtaſiatiſchen Völker verlieh, an denen er nach dem Willen Gottes eine große, weltgeſchichtliche Aufgabe erfüllen ſollte, Jer. 27, 1–11. Dieſem Gewaltherrſcher ſtellt Gott einen Propheten als Verkündiger ſeines Willens an die Seite. Nebukadnezar hört auf dieſen Propheten, und, durch deſſen Zeugniſſe belehrt und überwunden, gibt er

schließlich dem Allerhöchsten und Allmächtigen die Ehre, Kap. 2, 47; 3, 28. 29; 4, 31–34. Dann folgt der König Belsazer, ein viehischer Fresser und Säufer, den der Glanz des von seinem Vater Nabonid übernommenen Weltreichs zu maßloser Überhebung verleitet, der im Taumel des Hochmuts den Allerhöchsten frech verachtet und lästert.[11] Aber auch dieser trunkene Lästerer hört auf Daniel und erkennt aus dessen Worten die Gerechtigkeit Gottes und erfährt schließlich die richterliche Macht des Weltrichters, dessen Urteil die Tyrannen vom Thron stürzt, sobald das Maß ihrer Frevel voll geworden ist, Kap. 5, 22–30. Daniel ist auch mächtig im Reiche Darius' des Meders, Kap. 5, 31; 6, 28. Das war ein in seiner Weise gutmütiger, aber schwacher Fürst. Ohne daß er persönlich Gottes Volk haßt, wird er doch durch die List böser Ratgeber zu schreiender Ungerechtigkeit verführt. Aber auch er muß aus Daniels Erlebnissen und Worten erkennen, gegen wen er eigentlich angelaufen ist; er gibt schließlich dem Gotte Daniels die Ehre und hat gewiß auch etwas von den Gesichten, die Daniel während seiner Regierungszeit hatte, gehört und zu Herzen genommen, Kap. 6, 25–27; 9, 1; 11, 1. Und der letzte König, mit dem Daniel in Berührung kommt, ist der energische, tatkräftige, feuersprühende Perserkönig Cyrus oder Kores, unter dem das Weltreich wieder einen Höhepunkt erreicht, und der im Gehorsam gegen den göttlichen Willen den ihm von dem Lenker der Weltgeschichte zugewiesenen Beruf erfüllt. Auch im Reiche dieses Großkönigs war Daniel gewaltig, wie ausdrücklich hervorgehoben wird, Kap. 6, 28; 1, 21; 1, 10. Cyrus wird bei Jesaja ganz direkt Gottes Knecht, Gottes Hirte, Gottes Gesalbter genannt Kap. 41, 2. 25; 44, 28; 45, 1; 48, 14. Nebukadnezar mußte erst durch die Deutung des ihm entfallenen Traumes und namentlich durch die harte Züchtigung des Wahnsinns gedemütigt werden, Belsazer durch die Inschrift an der Wand, Darius durch das Wunder im Löwengraben, ehe sie dem Allerhöchsten die Ehre gaben. Cyrus dagegen erkennt, ohne Zweifel durch Daniels Wort und durch die Weissagungen des Jesaja unterwiesen, wie Hengstenberg richtig einmal bemerkt, „in dem Gott Israels den Urheber seiner Siege und beweist sich ihm dankbar durch die Wohltaten, die er seinem Volke erweist". Nebukadnezar war Gottes Knecht als strenger Gerichtsvollstrecker über die Sünden der Völker gegen das Reich Israel. Cyrus hat als Gottes Knecht den großen Beruf, im Gehorsam gegen den Gott Israels dem Volke dieses Gottes die Gefängnistüren aufzuschließen. Er wird so hoch geehrt, daß er sogar einen Namen erhält, der sonst nur dem Gesalbten und Erlöser Zions aus dem Hause Davids gebührt, Jes. 45, 1–7. Was für ein Mann und Prophet Gottes muß Daniel gewesen sein, wenn wir ihn in dieser großen, denkwürdigen Zeit und Umgebung betrachten!

Darum sagt Luther einmal: „Summa, es ist unter allen Abrahamskindern keiner so hoch in der Welt erhöht als Daniel. Es war

11) Inwiefern Nebukadnezar als Belsazers Vater bezeichnet werden kann, Kap. 5, 11. 13. 18. 22, soll später untersucht und erörtert werden.

Joſeph wohl groß in Ägypten bei König Pharao; ſo waren David und Salomo groß in Iſrael; aber es ſind alles geringe Könige und Herren gegen die Könige zu Babel und Perſen, bei welchen Daniel der oberſte Fürſt war, welche er auch wunderbarlich zu Gott bekehrt und ohne Zweifel in beiden Kaiſertümern große Frucht bei viel Leuten geſchafft hat, die durch ihn ſind zum Erkenntnis Gottes kommen und ſelig worden, wie denn derſelbigen Kaiſer Briefe und Gebote, daß man Daniels Gott in allen Landen ehren ſollte, wohl anzeigen, Dan. 2, 47 und 6, 26." Und dazu fügt Luther die Mahnung: „Dieſen Daniel befehlen wir nun zu leſen allen frommen Chriſten, welchen er zu dieſer elenden letzten Zeit tröſtlich und nützlich iſt." [12]

Freilich, ob Cyrus (und ebenſo Nebukadnezar) wirklich zur wahren, vollen, dauernden Erkenntnis des HErrn gekommen iſt, muß dahingeſtellt bleiben. Nach dem gleich zu erwähnenden Cyruszylinder im Britiſchen Muſeum war er Polytheiſt oder Indifferentiſt. „Aus dem, was die Schrift von ihm ſagt, läßt ſich nur etwa entnehmen, daß er aus ſeinen Erfolgen ſeine göttliche Sendung ſchloß und dafürhielt, der Gott Iſraels ſei der wahre Gott. Daß damit noch nicht ſeine Bekehrung gegeben war, zeigen Beiſpiele wie Bileam, Pharao, Ahab und andere." [13]

Mit dem, was die Schrift von Cyrus und ſeiner Tätigkeit für Iſrael in Daniels Tagen ſagt, ſteht nun nicht in Widerſpruch, daß nach der Weltgeſchichte Cyrus die beſiegten Völker nach einer neuen Politik in ihre Heimatsländer zurückkehren ließ. Das iſt Tatſache. Er befolgte nicht die Deportations-, ſondern die Reſtitutionspolitik. P. Volz bemerkt ganz richtig: „Im Gegenſatz zu den aſſyriſchen und babyloniſchen Herrſchern, die die unterworfenen Völker verpflanzt und ihre Götter weggeführt hatten, ließ Kores die Völker und ihre Götter an ihren Heimatort zurückkehren und die zerſtörten Tempel wiederherſtellen. So erhielt auch die jüdiſche Schar ſofort, 538, die Erlaubnis der Heimkehr und des Wiederaufbaus der Gemeinde und des Tempels, 2 Chron. 36, 22; Esra 1, 1." [14] Dies geht hervor aus einer alten Inſchrift, dem von einem babyloniſchen Mardukprieſter im Auftrag des Königs verfaßten ſogenannten Cyruszylinder, der zwar am Anfang ſehr lückenhaft iſt, da die Zeilen gebrochen ſind, in dem es aber von dem babyloniſchen Obergott Marduk und dem König Kores heißt: "The worship of Marduc, king of gods. . . . He wrought hostility against his city daily. . . . His [people], all of them, he destroyed through servitude, without rest. On account of their lamentation the lord of the gods was exceedingly angry and [left] their territory; the gods who dwelt among them left their dwellings in anger because he brought [them] into Babylon, Marduc . . . to return to all the dwellings, their habi-

12) VI, 941. 942.

13) Aug. Pieper, Jeſajas II, 220.

14) Calwer Bibellexikon, herausgegeben von P. Zeller und Th. Herrmann, S. 417.

tations which were overthrown." Und weiter unten heißt es: "The gods who dwelt in them I returned to their places and caused them to settle in their eternal shrines. All other people I assembled and returned them to their dwellings. And the gods of Sumer and Akkad, whom Nabuna'id, to the anger of the lord of the gods, had brought into Babylon at the command of Marduc, the great lord, I caused in peace to dwell in their abodes, the dwellings in which their hearts delighted.[15]) Gott, der HErr der Weltgeschichte, benutzt eben auch die Politik der Weltherrscher, um seine Ziele in seiner Kirche hinauszuführen.

Sonst haben wir freilich weiter keine Nachrichten über Daniel. Wie er ganz unerwartet auftritt, als jüdischer Knabe und Jüngling, der für den Hofdienst und Staatsdienst der Könige bestimmt ist, so verschwindet er auch vom Schauplatz, sobald er sein Amt ausgerichtet und die großen Weltreiche und das Reich des Königs Messias geschildert hat, wenn er einen Flug getan hat durch die ganze Welt- und Kirchengeschichte, wie wir noch sehen werden, bis zum Ende aller Tage. Und es ist wahrlich nicht nötig, sondern sehr überflüssig, töricht und vermessen gewesen, daß die späteren Juden das Leben dieses großen Mannes Gottes noch ausgeschmückt haben durch die apokryphischen Legenden vom Bel zu Babel und vom Drachen zu Babel, von der Susanna und Daniel. Diese jämmerlichen apokryphischen Lappen verunzieren nur den wunderbaren Rock, in den die Heilige Schrift den Daniel kleidet.[16]) Aber wenn Daniel auch plötzlich vom Schauplatz verschwindet, wenn wir auch nichts Zuverlässiges wissen über seine letzten Lebensjahre und sein Ende, er bekommt zum Schluß eine ganz tröstliche Zusage, eine Verheißung, die jeder Prediger und Lehrer hören möchte: „Viele, so unter der Erde schlafen liegen, werden aufwachen, etliche zum ewigen Leben, etliche zur ewigen Schmach und Schande. Die Lehrer aber werden leuchten wie des Himmels Glanz und die, so viele zur Gerechtigkeit weisen, wie die Sterne immer und ewiglich." Und dann folgt das Wort, mit dem sein ganzes Buch schließt: „Du aber, Daniel, gehe hin, bis das Ende komme, und ruhe, daß du aufstehest in deinem Teil am Ende der Tage", Kap. 12, 2. 3. 13.

L. Fürbringer

15) Rawlinsons *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, V, 35. Zitiert bei Barton, *Archeology and the Bible*, 385. 386.

16) Diese griechischen Zusätze zum Buche Daniel, die ebenfalls seine Weisheit und Gerechtigkeit herausstreichen sollen, aber recht deutlich in ihren Absurditäten den Unterschied zwischen kanonisch und apokryphisch zeigen, sind wohl nicht auf böse Absicht zurückzuführen, sondern sind der alexandrinischen Übersetzung, der sogenannten Septuaginta, später hinzugefügt worden, um das jüdische Volk und seine großen Männer zu verherrlichen und ihm eine noch größere Literatur zuzuschreiben.

Sermon Study on 1 Pet. 1:3—9

Eisenach Epistle for the First Sunday after Easter, Quasimodogeniti

In the opening greeting of his epistle Peter had reminded his readers of the eternal foreknowledge and predetermination of God the Father according to which they had been elected, chosen, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Obedience here signifies the obedience of faith, 1 Pet. 1:22; Rom. 10:16; 2 Cor. 10:5, that obedience which gladly receives the Word of God, Acts 2:41. Through such faith the believers are sprinkled with the blood of Jesus, all the blessings procured for man are appropriated to them. For such obedience and sprinkling they were elected, not by an absolute decree of God but "through sanctification of the Spirit." As the decree of election is based on the grace of God and the merits of Christ, so it has for its purpose, as its object, the sanctification of the elect and is carried out in time through, ἐν, within the sphere of, this work of the Holy Spirit, in this manner, that the Holy Spirit in time calls, regenerates, preserves, and finally brings them to eternal salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

Having called the attention of his readers to the hidden wellsprings of their salvation, the eternal decree of election, he now points out the realization of this decree in their own lives and the glorious goal toward which God has decreed to lead them. He does this in the form of a most beautiful eulogy of the Author and Finisher of their salvation.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, v. 3. "Blessed be God." Cp. 2 Cor. 1:3; Eph. 1:3. This phrase, so often met with in the Old Testament and in rabbinical writings, is not intended by the apostle as an exhortation to bestow upon God a gift, a blessing. God is not in need of man's gifts. He is ever blessed, 1 Tim. 1:11; 2 Tim. 6:15. Nor is there anything in the gift of man that could enrich God. Man can only stand before the throne of the ever blissful God and sing the praises of His holy name and magnify His mighty deeds. That is exactly what the Greek term for blessed here denotes. Εὐλογητός means well spoken of, praised, lauded. In the New Testament the word is used exclusively of God, though in the LXX it is applied to men also, while the New Testament writers use εὐλογημένος.

Peter now continues: *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* God is to be praised not only because He is God, the Creator of the universe, to whom all creatures owe their life and existence and therefore never-ceasing praises; He

is here called the God and Father of Christ. Peter knows of no other God than Him who is at the same time the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He is the God of Christ, the God who took Him out of the womb, Ps. 22:9; in whom He trusted, Ps. 22:9, 10; to whom He prayed, Heb. 5:7; Luke 6:12; 9:28, etc.; to whom He addressed that agonized cry, "My God, My God," Ps. 22:1; who raised Him from the dead, Acts 2:32; Eph. 1:20; who remained His God even in the state of exaltation, John 20:19; Eph. 1:20–22. This God is at the same time the Father of our Lord, and His Father not merely in the sense in which He is the Father of all mankind, Mal. 2:10, or of the Christians, 1 John 3:1. Such a Father He became in time. He is the Father of our Lord from eternity, Ps. 2:7; the Father of that Jesus whom Peter calls the Son of the living God, Matt. 16:16; John 6:69; the Prince of Life, Acts 3:15; the Lord of all, Acts 10:36; the Judge of the living and the dead, Acts 10:42; whom time and again He calls Lord, the term being on his lips merely as a synonym of God, the Lord, Jehovah, Jer. 23:6. All the blessings that have been decreed for us in eternity and that are coming down upon us from the throne of God are ours only because God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that Lord whom we confess as our God and Lord, John 20:28; that Lord and God through whom God, the everlasting I Am, has become our God and Lord, our Father. For this our Lord is Jesus, the Savior, Matt. 1:21. He is the Christ, the Anointed One, sent by God to be our Redeemer, to make us children of God. This mission for which the Son was sent was not in vain. Its purpose to gain children for God was accomplished. Peter blesses the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has begotten us again, ἀναγεννήσας. The word is peculiar to Peter, found only here and 1:23. Like ἀνα in ἀναζάω, live again, Rom. 14:9; in ἀναψύχω, refresh, 2 Tim. 1:16, the ἀνα here means again, the English prefix *re*, hence reborn, born again. This rebirth is the regeneration, παλιγγενεσία, of Titus 3:5; the γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν of John 3:3. See also Eph. 2:5, 6, 10; Gal. 6:15; Col. 2:12; Jas. 1:18.

Rebirth, regeneration, is a very appropriate term for this work of God. It is indeed the creation of a new life, a life that did not exist before, the birth of a new man with a new heart, new powers, faculties, emotions, will, 2 Cor. 5:17. By his first birth man enters into a state of spiritual blindness and death, 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:1; of sinful depravity, John 3:6; of ignorance concerning spiritual things, 1 Cor. 2:13; of thinking and doing only evil continually, Gen. 8:21; Matt. 15:19; of enmity against God, Rom. 8:7; without Christ, God, hope, Eph. 2:11, 12; Col. 1:21. All that is now changed. In regeneration spiritual life is engendered, Eph. 2:5, 6; Gal. 2:20; man's eyes are opened, so that he sees in Christ Cru-

cified and His Gospel true wisdom, 1 Cor. 1:30; Gal. 6:14; he loves God, Ps. 73:23–28; he delights in God's Word, Ps. 119:24; Rom. 7:22; 2 Cor. 1:4; he is zealous of good works, Titus 2:14; Eph. 2:10.

It is God that regenerates. Natural life exists only by the power and wisdom of Almighty God, the Author and Fountain of life, Ps. 36:9; Job 10:8–12; Ps. 139:14–16. It is impossible for man to give life to himself, or to restore life to himself once he has lost it. Just so impossible is it for man to give unto himself spiritual life or to restore it to himself if it is lost. To beget himself either naturally or spiritually is impossible for man, a contradiction in itself. It is a work, a miracle, of God, a new creation. We believe according to the working of His mighty power, Eph. 1:20. This manifestation of God's creative omnipotence in man's regeneration is motivated by His loving-kindness and grace, or, as Peter puts it, *according to His abundant mercy.* Mercy, ἔλεος, is pity, compassion, called forth by the misery of man and manifesting itself in deeds of mercy. Note the emphatic placing of the word *abundant,* much. Marvelous, indeed immeasurable, is His mercy which prompts Him to regenerate men. God, who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and who sent His Son to be the Redeemer of the world, saw that man would not and could not by His own reason or strength save himself. Life, salvation, heaven, immortality, may seem to natural man prizes worth striving for. But if he looks for life after death, it is a life earned by his own efforts. If he hopes for salvation, it is a salvation by character, by virtuous living. Salvation through Christ, life in the Crucified One, perish the thought! This pride, this opposition to God's plan of salvation, this rejection of Christ and His redemption, was all that God saw in man. That is all the gratitude He experienced for His great love, John 3:16. Did He cast all men away forever, these ungrateful wretches? No, as His love prompted Him to redeem them, so His "abundant mercy" moved Him to commiseration with their helplessness, their natural hopelessness. He did what man could never do — He gave to them new life, a spiritual life. He Himself brought them to faith through the means He Himself had appointed for this purpose, His Gospel, 1 Pet. 1:21; 1 Cor. 4:15; and Baptism, John 3:3, 5; Titus 3:5. He did not force regeneration upon man against his will. He made of unwilling enemies willing children. Graciously, lovingly, in the abundance of His mercy, in the fulness of compassion truly divine, Eph. 2:4, He melted their hearts of stone and filled them with faith and love and hope.

The heart of the reborn man is filled with hope. That is the purpose which God had in mind when He regenerated us — *He*

hath begotten us unto a lively hope. The absence of the article does not denote this hope as one of many hopes, but, as so frequently, brings out the qualitative force of the noun. This hope is really and actually hope, one worthy of the name, which has every characteristic of hope, making it not a vain illusion, but hope based on a solid foundation. This hope is a lively, living, hope. What hope natural man has of salvation, of a life after death, does not deserve the name of hope, much less of living hope. As man himself is spiritually dead, so his hope in all matters pertaining to spiritual welfare is a dead hope, which can at best deceive him by fairy-land visions and beautiful castles in the air but will vanish in the hour of death and will then turn into everlasting despair. The hope of regenerated man is a living hope; it is a hope characterized by life, having within itself an inexhaustible fountain of life, continuously living (present participle), remaining a living, undying hope, though all the forces of sin and hell rise up against it. Living hope conquers the fear of death, even death itself, even as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has begotten His children unto this living hope, knows neither fear of death nor death itself.

We were begotten unto this living hope *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.* The resurrection is mentioned here as the key-stone, the crowning feature, in Christ's glorious work of redemption. He had been among the dead. He had been placed in the grave, a corpse. The Prince of Life had been killed. Yet it was impossible that He should be holden of death, Acts 2:23, 24. He rose from the dead as the Conqueror of death. By this resurrection we are regenerated. The resurrection of Christ is not only a symbol of our spiritual resurrection, it is not only the immovable foundation on which the possibility of our regeneration rests; it is more than that. It is the fountainhead, the source, the generative power, of our rebirth unto a living hope. Christ's resurrection was not only the conquest of temporal death; it was His triumph over all our enemies, including spiritual death. Even spiritual death was conquered, vanquished, slain, by this Prince of Life, and life, not only temporal life, but spiritual and eternal life, was brought to light through His resurrection. The new birth, regeneration, was one of the gifts He brought out of His grave on resurrection morn and is now being offered to all men through His living Gospel, 1 Pet. 1:23. The risen Christ, the resurrection of Christ, regenerates. Through the risen Christ, the resurrection of Christ, God has begotten us. Cp. Eph. 2:5, 6. The Father and Christ are One; therefore the Son does whatsoever the Father does, John 5:19–21. Thus Is. 53:10–12 is fulfilled. (On "pleasure of the Lord" see Ex. 33:11, same word-stem; cp. also 2 Thess.

1:11. 12.) Says Luther: "Therefore we must teach in this manner: Behold, Christ has died for you. He has taken upon Himself, and placed Himself under, sin and death. Yet they could not conquer Him, for He was too strong. He is risen and has conquered and subdued unto Himself all enemies. And He did this in order that you might be delivered from them and be a lord over them. If you believe this, you have it."

To an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, v. 4. The apostle takes up the εἰς of v. 3 and repeats it in order to expand on our Christian hope unto which we have been regenerated and to show that it indeed deserves the name of hope and living hope. We are begotten again *to an inheritance.* Children are heirs. Having been begotten by God, having been born as His children, we are His, God's, heirs, Rom. 8:17; Gal. 4:7. This inheritance is worthy of our Father. Like Him, it is *incorruptible, undefiled, and fadeth not away.* As our divinely engendered hope is a living hope, so this divinely prepared inheritance is a living inheritance. Incorruptible! Who can fathom the contents of this one word while dwelling in this world, the abode of corruption? Wherever we look, corruption, decay, stares us in the face. Heaven and earth shall pass away, the mountains, emblems of eternity, shall vanish. Man is born with the germ of death. "Change and decay in all around I see." Yonder inheritance is not subject to corruption, to change; it is indestructible, eternal, as God Himself is eternal, Ps. 90:1. Undefiled, uncontaminated by sin, unspotted by unrighteousness. In this world the Serpent's slimy trail is everywhere in evidence. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one!" Job 14:4. "Forgive us our trespasses." My sin, my guilt, my enormous guilt! Father, I have sinned against Thee! Our inheritance there shall be undefiled! What ecstasy to breathe the pure air of Paradise, where righteousness and perfection shall dwell! Ps. 85:10, 11; Rev. 22:27. — *That fadeth not away.* How quickly do we tire of our joys in this present world! How soon are we dissatisfied with our pleasures and look for new ones! The pleasures of heaven, the bliss of eternity, will never fade. Never shall we grow weary of them. Time, even eternity, cannot age nor custom stale this perfect bliss. For then time will have ceased. We shall have left days and years and centuries and millenniums, all measurements of time, behind. Ageless, endless eternity, unlimited, unbounded, lies before us, embraces us, takes us up in its arms. The time of change and decay, of birth and death, of gaining and losing, of defilement and cleansing, of passing from one state to another, will be past and gone forever. Then we shall be like God in perfect holiness and righteousness, like

Him also in the enjoyment of that everlasting changelessness, that unending freshness, that never-ceasing novelty of heavenly bliss, Ps. 102:27; 2 Pet. 1:4. Calov quotes John Huss on this verse: "This inheritance is incorruptible in itself, undefiled by any other matter, it cannot be faded by time. It is incorruptible because it never depreciates, being affected neither by age nor sickness nor any sorrow. It is undefiled because it receives nothing unclean into itself. It fadeth not away because even long-continued enjoyment cannot finally impair the enjoyment of this heavenly life of the blessed."

Reserved in heaven. Τηρέω, to guard, keep, reserve. The perfect participle indicates that this reserving of our inheritance has taken place in the past and that the inheritance is still being carefully guarded, kept safe. As valuables are put in a safe-deposit box and this box is placed in a burglar-proof vault and, in addition, carefully watched over and protected against theft by special guards, so our inheritance has been placed in safe-keeping and is being carefully watched and guarded against all attempts to destroy it. It is reserved *in heaven.* The Bank of England is regarded as almost absolutely impregnable. Heaven is a safer place, Matt. 6:20. Heaven is where God is, where the angels, mighty men of valor, Ps. 103:20, are, where the forces of evil cannot enter. Those angels which seek to destroy the works of God and frustrate His plans are no longer in heaven, Jude 6; Rev. 12:7–9. They cannot cross that gulf, Luke 16:26. In heaven dwells only God and His holy angels, and God has prepared and reserved the inheritance for His children on earth, and His angels delight in safeguarding it. *For you,* εἰς, denotes motion, direction, unto, toward you, here in the sense of to the advantage of, for. A miser hoards and carefully guards his treasures for himself. The God of grace, who is abundant in mercy, has placed the inheritance in safe-keeping for others, for such as He wants to share with Him the possession and enjoyment of these heavenly treasures. For you, scattered strangers, v. 11, who have here no continuing city, Heb. 13:14, who nevertheless are elect according to God's grace, begotten again by the resurrection of Jesus, for you the Father has reserved, and is guarding, your inheritance.

Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time, v. 5. God is not satisfied with safeguarding the inheritance of His children. He knows that they themselves are in need of His constant watchful care and defense. They are kept, being kept, φρουρουμένους. This word, a military term, as Calov calls it, is used 2 Cor. 11:32 to describe the efforts to prevent Saul's escape from Damascus by setting guards at every gate. It is used Gal. 3:23 of the children of God

in the Old Testament whose every step, every movement, every action, was being watched, who could not escape the surveillance of the Law, which like a military guard was everlastingly calling, Halt! Forbidden! Thou shalt not! They were under the watchful eye of an untiring schoolmaster, Gal. 3:24, kept in bondage, 4:1, 3. That is the one activity of a guard, to prevent escape of those committed to his watch. So Christians are kept safe in their faith and hope, guarded against escape from, loss of, their glorious estate. That citadel of Christian faith and hope seems to the flesh a dreary dungeon, an intolerable imprisonment. Our state of adoption and sonship appears to the flesh as abject slavery, degrading serfdom. From this prison, this bondage, our flesh seeks to escape, longing for the liberty of walking again the broad and easy path of its own desires and lusts. We are kept safe from, guarded against, our own flesh and blood, prevented from escaping, running away from our glorious estate. The word *kept* includes more. A guard will guard his *protegés* also against attacks from without. We are kept safe, protected, against all efforts of our enemies to rob us of our glorious inheritance. All efforts of our own flesh to run away from God, all efforts on the part of Satan and the world to deprive us of our faith and hope, will be foiled. No enemy is strong enough to wrest from us our precious possession. We are kept by the power not of man, nor of angels only. Though our fellow-Christians may pray for us, admonish and strengthen us, though angels protect us on all our ways, there is needed, and there is active on our behalf, a stronger power than that of mortal man or created angel. We are kept *by the power of God.* The omnipotence of the God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the mighty strength of Him who has begotten us again, is our guarantee that we shall be kept, guarded, protected, until we have arrived at our precious heritage. That does not mean that we ever shall be unassailed by temptation, be exempt from all danger, free from all attacks. Our own flesh, the evil Foe, and the unbelieving world are constantly, twenty-four hours of the day, exerting all their power to regain us as their slaves and bond-servants, to rob us of our hope and inheritance. Yet just as continually, just as assiduously, just as ceaselessly (note the participle present), the Keeper of Israel, who neither slumbers nor sleeps, is watching over us. There is not a moment during which the Father's watchful eye is not upon His children, His powerful arm is not protecting, His mighty hand not upholding them, John 10:28; Ps. 27:1–6; Ps. 91. This truth does not contradict such passages as attribute the preservation of Christians to the grace, 1 Cor. 1:4, 8, and peace of God, Phil. 4:7, His faithfulness, 1 Cor. 1:9; 10:13. God's grace, peace, faithfulness, is omnipotent grace,

almighty peace and faithfulness. The grace, the peace, the faithfulness, the power, of the never-sleeping Keeper guards us against losing the inheritance which is reserved in heaven for us, unto which we were chosen from eternity.

God keeps us by His power *through faith.* Faith alone saves, Mark 16:16; and this faith must be persevering faith, Matt. 10:22. But such persevering faith God Himself keeps and preserves in us. By keeping us in faith until the end, He keeps us through faith unto salvation. Needless to say, as children of God we use those means by which God preserves faith, Word and Sacrament, John 8:31; Heb. 12:15; 2 Cor. 6:11.

Unto salvation. That is the blessed goal of our faith and hope, unto which we were begotten again, unto which we are kept by the power of God: salvation, deliverance from all evil, 2 Tim. 4:18, the final redemption from all sin and unrighteousness, everlasting bliss in the presence of God and our Savior. This salvation is ready, has already been prepared. It is that inheritance which is reserved in heaven ever since Christ suffered and died for us, John 14:2; invisible to mortal eyes, hidden, Col. 3:3; yet "ready to be revealed." All it needs is the lifting up and away from it, ἀπό, the covering, the veil, now hiding it from our view.

Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations, v. 6. "Wherein ye greatly rejoice," ἀγαλλιᾶσθε. The apostle uses a word denoting exceeding joy, exultation, shouting for joy. Matt. 5:8 the Lord uses this word in exhorting His followers to rejoice in tribulation. Many commentators find a similar exhortation here. Others regard it as the indicative and refer it to the present joy of the Christian, a foretaste of heavenly exultation. We prefer to take it with Luther as the futuristic presence. This usage is quite common in the New Testament, especially in predictions, as Robertson says: "The futuristic presence startles and arrests attention. It affirms and not merely predicts. It gives a sense of certainty." This sense fits in well with the context. The apostle, as it were, sees his readers on that Day assembled before the throne of God; he hears their glad shoutings of heavenly joy. He predicts not merely, he asserts, he assures them of the fact. If he referred to the present joy, it would seem that "now" would have been connected with "rejoice" rather than with "are in heaviness." In keeping with Peter's style "wherein" must be connected with "last time." Compare the similar construction, vv. 5, 8, 10, in each of which a new sentence connects with the last word of the preceding sentence. Finally ἐν denotes the time, not the object, of their rejoicing; that is added by ἐπί or a ἵνα clause. Cp. John 5:35: "rejoice *in* his light," "while his light shone," Thayer. In that

last time ye rejoice, shall rejoice, *though now,* in this present time, which hurries past, Job 7:6, 7; 9:25; 24:29; Ps. 39:6 ("now" points to a future time, when they will not suffer but rejoice), *for a season,* ὀλίγον, denotes both a short time and a small number or measure. Both meanings fit here. What are the few years of life on earth compared with the eternity of heaven? And what are all the sorrows of this present time, even though they be exceedingly grievous, Job 10:20; Lam. 3:1–19, compared with the glory to be revealed in us? Rom. 8:18. *If need be.* Christians suffer only if in the wisdom of their God and Father, who has chosen and begotten them, it is necessary, if it is helpful, beneficial, to them, Lam. 3:26, 27, 31–33; Heb. 12:4–12. If it is not necessary, our Father will not once afflict us.

Ye are in heaviness, λυπηθέντες. The aorist again proves that the rejoicing of the Christians will take place after they have sorrowed. The present participle would have been the proper tense if their rejoicing were to be contemporaneous with their suffering. *Through manifold temptations,* testings, provings. Because these testings are often vexatious, agonizing, to the Christians, the word is often used in the sense of afflictions, trouble, adversity, exactly as the English word trial is used in both senses. What intense anguish did the testing of Abraham's faith cause him! Yet he stood the test, Rom. 4:18–21. What a trial for Jesus were the temptations which He underwent! Can the children of Abraham, the brethren of Jesus, look for a life of ease, free from trouble, untouched by storms? These trials are *manifold,* of divers sorts, varied. Not all Christians have the same experiences, and every Christian has many different trials, as his individuality, his personality, differs from that of other children of God and as he is gradually being developed unto a perfect man, Eph. 4:13, under the wise training and discipline of the Father. This is the thought brought out in the next verse.

That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ, v. 7. The "trial," δοκίμιον, that by which something is tried, used in the LXX of a crucible, Prov. 27:2; Ps. 12:7; used here metonymically, *efficiens pro effectu,* in the sense of approved character, genuineness. The genuineness of faith is described as being *much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire.* Gold is perishable, but, δε, it can be refined. Yet even after refinement it remains corruptible; it wears away, perishes at the end of time. The genuineness of a Christian's faith is more precious, of far greater value, of a far more precious and noble character, than that of gold. It is imperishable, of incorruptible gen-

uineness. This quality of the Christian faith, retaining its trust, its unshaken confidence in spite of all trials, obstacles, oppositions, storms, is generally doubted and ridiculed by unbelievers, cp. 1 Cor. 1:21–28, and is challenged by Satan before the very throne of God, Job 1:9–11; 2:4, 5. Yet in due time, when Christ Jesus, the Author and Finisher of the Christians' faith, shall appear, v. 7, when God, who has engendered this faith in them and thereby has begotten them as His children, will give them their inheritance, then the genuineness of their faith, far more precious than gold, *will be found,* will be recognized by all, will manifest itself in its true character, in its sterling quality, which nothing could change or corrupt or destroy, and it will be *found unto praise and honor and glory.* God Himself will publicly and in the face of all opponents and calumniators acknowledge and praise the genuineness of their faith, 1 Cor. 4:5, even as He praised the faith of Job, Job 1:8; 2:3; 42:7–10. He will grant to them honor and glory by granting them to participate in the honor and glory of Jesus Christ, Heb. 2:7, which itself consists in participating in the Father's honor and glory, 1 Tim. 1:17. Cp. Matt. 13:43; John 17:22–24; 2 Tim. 2:12; Rom. 2:7, 10; 9:21. This manifestation of the genuineness of their faith unto praise and honor and glory will take place *at the appearing of Jesus Christ;* cp. Luke 17:30; Rom. 8:19; Col. 3:3, 4; 1 John 3:2.

Whom, having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls, vv. 8, 9. The readers of the epistle have not, like Peter and the apostles, seen their Lord and Savior; yet they love Him, ἀγαπᾶτε, are attached to Him with a constant, enduring love, a love by choice, based not merely on emotion, but on the knowledge and daily experience of what Christ has done, and is daily doing, for them; a noble love, combined with highest veneration for His exalted personality, yet remaining love, deep-seated, wholehearted, for He is their Savior God. *In whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing.* They have not seen Him, ἰδόντες, and as long as it is *now,* they are not seeing Him, ὁρῶντες, He is still hidden from their eyes. Yet they are believing ones. The invisibility of Christ does not affect their divine assurance. Their faith, begotten of God, reaches out into those hidden realms of invisible glory. Faith is convinced of the reality of its objects. divinely sure, Heb. 11:1.

Ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. "Rejoice" again is futuristic presence. This is demanded by the contrast to "*now* ye see Him not." Had the apostle meant to refer to present joy, he would have placed the "now" before "rejoice" or omitted it.

The present joy of Christians cannot be called a glorified joy. The present participle, "*receiving* the end," etc., denotes a joy contemporaneous with the receiving, hence a joy still lying in the future. *Joy unspeakable* shall then fill their hearts. Human language cannot describe the glories, the joy, and the exultation of eternal life. This joy of heaven is one of those mysteries that the human mind cannot conceive, even though the fact of it is revealed in Holy Writ, 1 Cor. 2:9, 10. Already in this world great joy may surpass verbal expression, may be too deep, too wonderful, for words. Overwhelmed, almost awed, one stands in silence, until finally the pent-up joy finds expression in glad shoutings and jubilant songs of praise. Compare the remarkable passage Zeph. 3:17: "He will rejoice over thee with joy; He will rest," be silent, "in His love." His joy and love, humanly speaking, are beyond expression. A marvelous example of the love and joy that will fill our hearts and minds, our whole beings, in yonder life. This joy will be *full of glory,* δεδοξασμένη, glorified; cp. Rom. 8:30. As their human bodies will be changed like unto the glorious body of Christ, Phil. 3:21, so their joy, now a joy of humiliation, shall be transformed into a state of glorification suitable to its glorious surroundings. The object of this joy will be Jesus Christ. He is the One in whom they were chosen in eternity, v. 2; through His resurrection they were regenerated, v. 3; through faith in Him they are kept unto salvation, v. 5; at His appearance in glory they shall be glorified with Him and by Him, v. 7; He shall be the chief object of their never-ending joy. In Him they shall truly enjoy the bliss of life eternal. He is the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, and the Everlasting One in the great work of salvation.

This joy and rejoicing will reach its perfection of glory when they shall *receive the end of their faith.* Κομίζω, to carry off as a prize, receive, obtain. Even if moments of unspeakable joy, almost approaching heavenly rapture, may be granted to believers already in this vale of tears, yet they are only brief moments, followed by periods of quiet joy or even of sadness, of bitter sorrow, almost stifling all expressions of joy. Only when He, their Life, shall be manifested in His glory, then for the first time, and then forever, their joy will be a glorified, a perfected joy, a never-ceasing jubilant service of God and their Savior, in which Ps. 118:15 ff. shall be then fulfilled in perfection. Then faith and its sister, hope, will cease to be, for then they have reached *the end,* the goal, *of faith.* Faith and hope shall have served their purpose, and served it well. Faith has brought them to the goal, put them in possession of their prize, and hope has cheered them on the way. Now there is no more need of faith, because they see Him as He is; now there is no more need of hope, for they are in full possession and enjoy-

ment of *the salvation of their souls.* The word "soul" does not exclude the body but is used in the sense of individual life, personality, the ego; cp. Acts 2:41, 43; Rom. 13:1, etc. In that day the same Jesus Christ who rose from the dead on that first Resurrection Day will be manifested as the Savior of our bodies also from the power of death, John 5:25–29; Is. 25:8; 26:19; Rev. 20:13. What a glorious resurrection morn for all believers! What a glorious day of home-coming that will be! Ps. 126. Then salvation full and complete will be ours. No longer shall we be tossed about by wind and weather but be safe in the harbor from which we never again shall launch forth. No longer shall we be beset by sin, no longer harassed by doubts, assailed by enemies, afflicted with tribulations; no longer will it be necessary constantly to crucify the flesh, Gal. 5:24; 1 Cor. 9:27; but finally and forever we shall be delivered, saved, from the hand of all that hate us, Luke 1:71, 74, 75; Is. 35:10; Rev. 7:14–17.

This passage has been admirably chosen as the pericope for the First Sunday after Easter, Quasimodogeniti Sunday. It speaks of the resurrection of Christ as the source of our regeneration. Christ's resurrection and the Christians' regeneration are intimately connected. *Easter Time a Time of Rejoicing.* 1) Christ is risen from the dead. 2) Through His resurrection we are begotten again unto a lively hope. 3) As children of God we are sure of our inheritance. — *The Resurrection of Christ the Heart of Christianity.* 1) It is the source of our regeneration. 2) It is the fountainhead of our hope. 3) It is the well-spring of eternal joy. — *Thanks Be to God, who has Begotten Us Again.* 1) By His abundant mercy; 2) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ; 3) unto a lively hope. — *At Easter-time We Praise God* 1) for Christ's resurrection from the dead; 2) for our resurrection from spiritual death; 3) for our resurrection unto eternal joy. — The keynote of our passage is Christian hope based on Christ's resurrection. On my way to church I pass a street called Hope Street. It leads off one of the main highways of the State, but leads nowhere. At its head is a sign "No Through Street." After running 200 feet, it ends abruptly, a fence of heavy timbers effectually making further progress impossible. That is a symbol of the hope of the unbeliever. *Christian Hope Is Sure Hope.* 1) It is based on Christ's resurrection. 2) It leads to an incorruptible inheritance. — *The Christian Religion a Religion of Certainty.* 1) God has regenerated us unto a sure hope. 2) God keeps us through faith unto salvation. 3) God will finally give unto us our inheritance.

TH. LAETSCH

Miscellanea

Grundsätze für Kindergottesdienste

Wir zitieren aus einem Artikel von Siebrasse in der „Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst", der in einem Artikel über „Die Liturgie des Kindergottesdienstes" unter anderm schreibt:

„1. Luther wollte die eingedeutschte, altkirchliche Kirchenordnung der Mette vornehmlich als den Schul- und Jugendgottesdienst für alle Tage angesehen wissen. . . .

„4. Die Forderung nach der Kindertümlichkeit des Kindergottesdienstes ist abzulehnen.

„5. Es ist zu fordern, daß der Kindergottesdienst nicht kindertümlich, sondern gemeindemäßig und Gottesdienst im vollen Sinne sei. Nicht das Kind ist das Maß der Dinge im Kindergottesdienst, sondern die Anbetung Gottes und die Verkündigung seines Wortes.

„a. Darum sollen auch grundsätzlich die Eltern und sonstige Gemeindeglieder vom Kindergottesdienst nicht ausgeschlossen sein.

„b. Darum läuten zum Kindergottesdienst die Glocken, gehört in den Kindergottesdienst das Orgelspiel, brennen die Lichter auf dem Altar und vollzieht der Liturg seinen Dienst im Talar."

Diese Grundsätze finden ihre Anwendung auch unter unsern Verhältnissen hier in Amerika, sowohl im Metten- wie im Vespergottesdienst, besonders auch an den großen Festtagen und sollten uns so bald als möglich veranlassen, von dem bloßen Katechesen- und Vortragsgottesdienst abzukommen und der ganzen Gemeinde ihr Recht, auch in dem Weihnachtskindergottesdienst, einzuräumen. P. E. K.

Was die theologische „Wissenschaft" sich neuerdings in der Übersetzung der Bibel leistet

Ein ganz neues Werk, das von Deutschland aus sehr hoch gepriesen wird, ist Emil Faders „Die Bildersprache der Evangelien". Es ist wirklich traurig, daß ein Mann, der auf dem Gebiete der theologischen Wissenschaft arbeitet, die Geschichtlichkeit der Evangelien beiseitesetzen will, wie der Verleger schreibt: „Mit unserer neuen Verdeutschung der Evangelien wird der Beweis [?] erbracht werden, daß diese Schriften nicht als historische Berichte, sondern als symbolische Kunstwerke, die die Einheit der Idee wahren, aufzufassen sind."

Die vermeintlichen Ergebnisse der „sprachschöpferischen Forschung" sind von so merkwürdiger Art, daß wir hier eine Probe mitteilen, hauptsächlich um zu zeigen, wie weit man von der Schrift abirren kann, wenn man die Worte nicht einfach annimmt, wie sie lauten. Matth. 6, 24—28 lautet bekanntlich: „Niemand kann zweien Herren dienen. Entweder er wird einen hassen und den andern lieben, oder er wird dem einen anhangen und den andern verachten. Ihr könnt nicht Gott dienen und dem Mammon. Darum sage ich euch: Sorget nicht für euer Leben, was ihr essen und trinken werdet, auch nicht für euren Leib, was ihr anziehen werdet. Ist nicht das Leben

mehr denn die Speise und der Leib mehr denn die Kleidung? Sehet die Vögel unter dem Himmel an: sie säen nicht, sie ernten nicht, sie sammeln nicht in die Scheunen; und euer himmlischer Vater nähret sie doch. Seid ihr denn nicht viel mehr denn sie?"

Die neue „symbolische Verdeutschung" gibt diesen Passus so wieder: „Niemals sind zwei verschiedene Geistesrichtungen zu vereinigen. Die eine Richtung schließt ja doch stets die andere aus. Deshalb ist es auch für die Schaffenden unmöglich, die schöpferische Geistesrichtung zu vereinigen mit der materialistischen Geistesrichtung. Also müssen die Schaffenden wissen, daß für sie die Bemühung um eine besondere materielle Lebenshaltung nicht in Betracht kommen kann. Es steht doch auch ganz außer Frage, daß das inwendige Leben über materielle Äußerlichkeiten erhaben ist. Es ist auch zu beachten, daß die Vitalität, wie sie verschiedentlich vorhanden ist und den Untergrund des Schöpferischen bildet, nicht von materieller Zielsetzung abhängig ist; denn allemal wird die Vitalität in ihrem Bestand von dem autoritären schöpferischen Geist maßgebend beeinflußt. Alles Leben, das diesen Einfluß erfährt, erhebt sich dann in seiner Steigerung ohne Frage bedeutend über das bloß Vitale."

Hierüber wird jeder Leser sein eigenes Urteil bilden können.

P. E. K.

Der Gottesname in der ältesten germanischen Bibelübersetzung

In seinem lieferungsweise erscheinenden Werk „Die Bekehrung der Germanen zum Christentum" kommt der Verfasser, Prof. D. Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, auch auf die Wahl des Gottesnamens bei Wulfila, der in seiner Übersetzung der Bibel neue, dem gotischen Volke unbekannte Dinge und Begriffe formte und seinen Brüdern nahezubringen suchte. Der Verfasser fährt hier fort:

„Für den neuen Gottesbegriff setzt er **gup**, das zwar dem Heidentum bekannt, aber, nach dem Nordischen zu schließen, nicht so geläufig war wie **áss (ans)**. Die Wahl war sicher klug, denn sonst wären falsche Vorstellungen immer wieder hochgekommen. Das Wort ist ursprünglich Neutrum, wird aber von Wufila maskulinisch verwandt. Kauffmann vermutet, daß das heidnische ‚Gott' für Wulfila neutrisch geblieben ist. Eine Fülle von Zusammensetzungen mit **gup** wird Wulfila erst selbst geprägt haben. Die heidnischen Götter werden z. B. mit **galiuga-gup** = Lügengötter bezeichnet; vgl. ferner **gudaskaunei**, die Schönheit Gottes = θεοῦ μορφή; **gagups** = εὐσχήμων, ‚mit Gott seiend'; **gagudei** = εὐσέβεια, ‚das Einssein mit Gott'; **afgups** = ἀσεβής, ‚unfromm'. Zum Teil ist hier der biblische Sinn besser getroffen als im Griechischen. Das neutestamentliche κύριος (HErr) wird mit **frauja** übersetzt, das etymologisch mit ‚Freyr', aber auch mit unserm Adjektiv ‚froh' zusammengehört und den Begriff des Heiligen und Herrlichen, Erfreuenden wiedergibt. Die Gnade Gottes aber gibt er mit **hulps**, unserm Worte ‚hold', wieder; **hulps wisan** ‚gnädig sein'; daher **gup, hulps sijais mis fravaurhtamma:** ‚Gott, sei mir Sünder gnädig!' "

In diesem Zusammenhang schreibt Schmidt ganz richtig: „Wulfilas Werk ist also die Christianisierung und nicht die Hellenisierung der gotischen Sprache."

P. E. K.

The Objectivity of Grace

Dr. Alfred E. Garvie writes: "Luther's emphasis on the corporeal presence of Christ *in, with,* and *under* the elements (consubstantiation) was not merely sacramentalism, for he always subordinated the Sacraments to the Gospel, but was zeal for the gospel of the real saving presence of Christ, the objectivity of grace, whether faith responded to it or not; always available, whether accepted or not. To a subjective individualism, which lays such stress on the receptivity and responsiveness of faith as to give the impression that the human condition is creative of the divine reality, instead of recognizing that it is the divine reality which evokes the human faith, this teaching is a salutary correction; what is to be regretted is that Luther bound up the truth of Christ's presence in the Sacraments with an artificial metaphysics." (*The Fatherly Rule of God,* p. 126.)

Dr. Garvie is telling the Church that it needs the teaching of Luther on the objectivity of grace. He is not right in thinking that Luther taught consubstantiation nor in speaking of "an artificial metaphysics" in connection with the Lutheran teaching on the Real Presence nor in mentioning only the "real saving presence of Christ" in the Sacrament, excluding the real presence of the real body and blood of Christ. He is right, however, in insisting that it is the divine reality of grace which evokes the human faith and asking the Church to listen to Luther.

He is thereby asking us to keep this testimony alive. It is the business of the Lutheran Church to uphold the objective nature of salvation, the objectivity and reality of the vicarious satisfaction as not being conditioned on any supplementary work and act of man and the objective nature of the means of grace, as offering the forgiveness of sins outright to men and exercising their power in every case where they are applied. It is the business of the Lutheran Church to warn against the subjectivism of the sects, which make the validity of the pardon offered in the means of grace and their efficacy dependent on the hearer's and recipient's subjective attitude; and we need to warn ourselves continually against this fatal aberration. Dr. Pieper writes: "'The characteristic feature of our dear Evangelical Lutheran Church is her objectivity; this means that all her doctrines by their very nature keep man from seeking his salvation in himself, in his own powers, aspirations, performance, and condition, and lead him to seek his salvation outside of himself; while the characteristic feature of all other churches is their subjectivity; they all lead man to ground his salvation upon himself.' (Dr. Walther.) And that is done particularly through their denial of the Biblical doctrine of the means of grace." (*Lehre u. Wehre,* 36, p. 119.)

It is unfortunate that Dr. Garvie himself could write on page 113: "It is only as in the Sacraments faith receives and responds to grace that they can be both signs and seals of the Gospel." It is by faith alone that we obtain the profit of the Sacraments, but they do not get their efficacy as signs and seals from faith. E.

A Debito ad Posse non Valet Consequentia

The Romanists are unable to see the force of this logical truth. They say that, since God commands the keeping of the Law, man must be able to fulfil the Ten Commandments. Erasmus and the synergists labor under the same logical weakness. They say that, since men are asked to repent and believe, it follows that natural man has some spiritual ability. (Read up in Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* on this logical and doctrinal heresy.) And not even the master of philosophy, Kant, was able to escape this fallacious reasoning. In his book *Religion within the Bounds of Pure Reason* he says: "In spite of that defection (the apostasy from goodness to evil) the command 'We *ought* to become better men' still resounds undiminished in our souls. Consequently, we must be *able* to become better men." On this point A. N. Rogness writes in the *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference*, February, 1938, p. 31 ff.: "All these thinkers have realized, as Kant in his final postulate, that the inescapable implication of a *must* is a *can*. It would be folly for man's rational nature or a government or God to say, 'Thou must' if there were not existent the possibility of 'I can.' Kant met the problem by postulating 'free will.' But his solution was not complete. For, though he boldly asserted the freedom of the will, his more practical observations caused him to admit that 'the niggardly provision of nature' prevented the will from conquest over the anarchy of man's perverse nature. So, in essence, freedom of the will became an ideal reality but an existential chimera. The problem of *can* was still unsolved, although in Kant the world received the classic of all philosophical attempts. . . . There have been those who, in order to produce a *can*, have implicitly discarded the *must*. These have been variously called materialists, empiricists, and later behaviorists. They have made man another unit in the deterministic order of a natural world."

Then why does God command men to keep His holy Law? And what does it mean when God asks the sinner to repent and believe? Luther told Erasmus that he had no right to turn imperative passages into indicative statements. The *must* does not imply the synergistic *can*. But there is a good reason why the *must* is demanded of the impotent sinner. And there is a divine way of turning the *must* into a *can*. Our article says, in the spirit of Luther: "What, then, does the Church offer this immoral man in his immoral society? First, it offers him despair. It seeks by the Word to bring him into the dreadful tension of the imperative *must* and the impotent *can*; and in this tension it leads him to a recognition of his dilemma. In other words, it makes him see himself lost in trespasses and sin, standing creditless before the awful judgment of a righteous God. For it knows that this is the impoverishment which alone can make him rich. Secondly, it confronts him with the redemptive forgiveness in Christ, in which the *must* is resolved in the vicarious *can* of Jesus. It *gives* man the faith to appropriate this reconciliation and stands him up on his two feet before God a new man, where he inherits the peace of full righteousness.

And, finally, it makes him a new man not alone in a judicial sense, but in an actual. For the will of Christ living in him enlivens his will to all that is good, and he begins the journey of sanctification. It has removed him from the tyranny of the Law and has set him free on the high Gospel plateau of grace. In this Gospel is the resolution of the ethical difficulty. . . . The Law is the *must* of morals; the Gospel is the only synthesis of the *must* and the *can*." E.

Another Attempt to Improve the Liturgy

Among the various attempts to make a change in our Order of Morning Worship, or the Holy Communion, one which recently came calls for just a remark or two concerning the entire movement.

Whatever order is used, we must guard against the suggestion that the second part of the Morning Service, the Holy Communion, represents a higher summit than the service of the Word. It may have more significance for the faith of the communicant, inasmuch as it makes such a definite application of the divine promise of grace to the individual. But we must never forget that it is the word of God which is in and with the elements that gives the Sacrament its power and that the latter is effective only in the measure in which the word of the Gospel, as brought to the attention of the communicant specifically in the mystery of the Holy Communion, is understood, accepted, and trusted. As for all the rest, it will be advisable for all pastors to read and study frequently the paragraph of Luther in his preface to the Small Catechism. (*Concordia Triglotta*, 537 f. §§ 21—27.) P. E. K.

Second Notice of the Summer Session at Concordia Seminary St. Louis, Mo.

The Summer-school and Pastors' Institute at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., will be held immediately after the sessions of Synod, from June 27 to July 9, inclusive. The faculty and lecturers will include such men as Dr. L. Fuerbringer, Dr. Theo. Engelder, Dr. F. Pfotenhauer, Prof. E. J. Friedrich, Prof. O. P. Kretzmann, Dr. J. T. Mueller, Prof. F. E. Mayer, and possibly one or two additional men. Among the leaders of devotions we shall have Dr. H. B. Hemmeter and Pastor Paul Koenig.

All pastors who intend to take part are urgently requested to announce as soon as possible to the Director of the Summer Session, Prof. P. E. Kretzmann, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

I. Amerika

New Testament Commentary, Herbert C. Alleman, Editor. — The *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference,* February, 1938, prints a review of this United Lutheran Church publication, by Dr. M. Reu. The original appeared in the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift.* The translation is by Dr. E. H. Rausch. The concluding paragraphs of Dr. Reu's review read: "We took the commentary in happy anticipation and read it with the sincere desire to do justice to it. Much of it has filled us with joy and thanksgiving; other things also, it is true, caused us much heartache. If this were the work of a private individual, we could expect that the offical representation would disavow the offending sections and see to it that these could have no influence on the whole of the Church. But the commentary as a whole goes out with the sanction of the Board of Publication, hence has an official character. We fear it may be a milestone in the history of the Lutheran Church in our country and retard for decades what many believed to be of the immediate future. What stands between a Church with such an official commentary and many other Lutheran churches as a separating wall is now no more only the question of verbal inspiration, which now — without being more closely defined — is disavowed at every opportunity; it is now the question of the authority of Scripture itself, not only in antiquarian things and matters of natural science, but even in religious things. The exposition of Prof. R. T. Stamm (Gettysburg) reaches deeply into the picture of Christ. If teachers of theology go to such lengths, where will their pupils land? To sow wind is to reap whirlwind.

"We write this in deep sorrow. We belong to those who hoped for the mutual recognition of the American Lutheran Church and the United Lutheran Church in America. We are united with strong bonds of friendship with many members of the United Lutheran Church. I will never forget how leading men of the same came to my assistance in the very moment when they heard of my difficulties. I know that many of their members will continue to teach and preach as true Lutherans and will never recognize a Bible that has first passed through a critical interpretation and purification as the norm for doctrine and life. But all this dare not deter from bearing witness against a current whose critical attitude towards Scripture, if it prevail, can only result in loss for the Church."

The liberal, modernistic attitude of some of the contributors to this book appears from the following excerpts from Dr. Reu's review. "The chapter on 'The Historical Relationships of Christianity,' by R. T. Stamm, is replete with many single surprising statements. We note just a few: 'The Book of Daniel was a tract written for these troubled times when King Antiochus, enraged by the failure of his plans to conquer Egypt, determined to punish the Jews for the trouble they had been making him.' 'Antiochus Epiphanes was the Darius of the Book of Daniel. He was also the Nebuchadnezzar with the golden image and the fiery fur-

nace, the king whose very fury to compel the Jews to abandon their religion was self-defeating.' 'As we have already seen in our study of the Book of Daniel, apocalyptic is essentially past history written in the future tense. The apocalyptist wrote history in the form of prediction. This does not mean that he deceived his readers by writing under the assumed name of some ancient worthy such as Daniel or Enoch or Ezra. The writers of the apocalypses and their first readers understood the literary device. It was only the succeeding generations, for whom their works were not immediately intended, who began to misunderstand them.' All this is presented not as the opinion of many present-day expositors, but as an actuality, and this in spite of the fact that then Jesus also (Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14) and Paul (2 Thess. 2) and John made the 'mistake' that they transformed the apocalypse of Daniel with its 'dreams' from a book of history into a book of predictions! . . . We read on page 56: 'It [the New Testament apocalypse], too, is mainly past history written in the future tense, and like its predecessor it has suffered such misinterpretation. Its readers have treated it just as its author himself treated the Book of Daniel and the other apocalyptic material upon which he drew so heavily.'

"Now we understand why afterwards (p. 292) Mark 13 this 'little apocalypse' is not a reproduction of a speech of Jesus for the author of this chapter, but the interpolation of 'some teaching about the future which had long been current in the churches.' Now we understand why at the close of his exposition of Mark 13 concerning the second coming of Christ he writes (p. 295): 'As time passed, less stress was laid on the visible and temporal aspects of the Second Coming. The writer of the gospel of John, while recording the older form of the hope for the benefit of the more conservative Christians of his church, taught his readers that, strictly speaking, judgment is a present process and that for Christians there is no death: 'Whosoever liveth and believeth on Me shall never die,' John 11:26. 'Jesus had come again as the "Comforter," the Holy Spirit, whom the Father had sent in His name to be resident in the hearts of believers, John 20:21, 22; 14:26.' In this same way liberal theology began in Germany during the 19th century; so also liberal theology round about us in our own land often maintains in the present day. But while there as here a strong reaction against it has begun, now, *post festum,* comes a Lutheran of America and carries these destructive thoughts as the result of his 'scientific' work into the circles of teachers in Sunday-school! 'For the benefit of the more conservative Christians' we can even today, following the example of John, speak of 'the older form of hope' and permit the passage 'From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead' to remain in the Apostles' Creed, knowing at the same time that, 'strictly speaking, judgment is a present process' and the coming of Christ is an inner coming, which perfects itself in the coming of the Spirit into the heart.

"The second section of the volume brings the exposition of the individual books. Here also most collaborators have done excellent work. Dr. Offermann's exposition of the Gospel according to Matthew is especially worthy of mention. . . . But this second section also includes articles of a different kind. A person is surprised, for instance, to find

statements like the following in the exposition of the Gospel according to Luke by Dr. H. C. Alleman and Dr. John Aberly: 'The story [of the Gergesene demoniac] is told in the psychology of the day. Delusional insanity was a demoniacal possession which might well seem to be the presence of ten thousand devils.' . . . We are still more surprised over statements like the following: 'The restoration of Jairus' daughter is regarded by Luke as a rising from the dead ("knowing that she was," v. 53).'

"The sorriest production in this field has again been achieved by Stamm and after him by Berkenmeyer. . . . Stamm on Mark 4:12: 'For the modern man, however, such an interpretation (*i. e.*, Mark's interpretation) of the purpose of Jesus' teaching raises great ethical difficulties.' On Mark 5:22 ff: 'There can be little doubt that Mark meant to narrate an actual raising from the dead. It would have been inconceivable to the Christians of his day that Jesus had not done as great things as they read in the Scriptures about Elijah and Elisha. Similar stories are told of Jesus' contemporaries and followers. In Acts 9:36-42 Peter is reported to have raised Tabitha from the dead, and according to Acts 20:8-10 Paul was thought to have restored the life of Eutychus. Was the servant greater than the Lord?' Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane can only be so understood 'that even to the last he had clung to the hope that the Kingdom could be established without His actual dying.'

"W. C. Berkenmeyer of the faculty of the Philadelphia seminary writes: 'The speeches of Peter and Paul are far from verbatim. In fact, to many fine scholars (Holtzmann, Von Soden, R. Scott) the author of Acts is regarded as a possible redactor, if not the author of the Pastorals' (p. 581). . . . On 1 Tim. 2:9-15: 'We ought to regard such an allegorical exegesis of Genesis, with the belief in the literal historicity of the Biblical account of the creation of man and woman, which is implied, as part of the intellectual-philosophical *milieu* of the writer, which we need neither accept nor consider as the testimony of his religious consciousness as the inspired Christian prophet any more than we would his command of Attic Greek, his science of astronomy, or his apocalyptic interpretation of history.'" (Cf. Conc. Theol. Mthly., 1937, pp. 869, 393; 1935, p. 553.) E.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Common Service. — On this topic the Rev. George J. Muller writes thus in the *Lutheran:*

Is an anniversary worth celebrating, especially an anniversary of fifty years? Usually we make quite a big event out of such a golden anniversary, and yet here we are in 1938, the fiftieth year of the issuance of the Common Service and no plans have been publicized for the celebration of this important event in the history of our Lutheran Church in America. All Lutheran congregations in America can today be divided into two groups, liturgically; one uses the Service and the other does not. Perhaps we might make even another division, between those that use, and those that abuse, the Service.

Important as have been the various developments of our Church on American soil, none has equaled the value and importance in the life of our people of the proper use of the proper liturgy. Here is the one

way in which a measure of American Lutheran unity has been attained. We have learned to treasure the same liturgical expression of our faith and in a certain measure have achieved the possibility of singing it together. The three bodies that later formed the United Lutheran Church first cooperated in the preparation of the Common Service. Then they published it. Next they learned to use it, and finally they united their forces in one Church organization.

Though the Common Service originated outside of the Missouri Synod, it has been adopted by them, also by Augustana, and is found complete with the same music as is in the Common Service Book in the new hymnal of the American Lutheran Church. So it seems to me that in 1938 some recognition should be shown to the liturgy which has achieved the only complete unity of acceptance of any item in the practical life of the Lutheran synods of America.

What can be done about it? How can we in a measure celebrate this truly vital part of our present-day American Lutheran life in all synods?

My first suggestion would be that every pastor and every interested Lutheran should first read and study the "Preface of 1888." I know it is in the Common Service Book, but I also regret to believe that there are thousands of our pastors and more of our church-workers who have never read it at all. Unfortunately this preface is not in the hymnals of the other synods; so the only possible way that it could be brought to them would be by way of their own church-papers. And to the editors of these papers I offer this as a gentle hint.

Professor Graebner in his book on *Problems of Lutheran Unity* has a chapter on "Our Liturgical Chaos." I read it with mingled shivers of shame and despair. Not because I rejoiced in the iniquity of the Missouri Synod but because of the shame I felt that any of the pastors of our Church would thus mangle and despise their Lutheran heritage. And then I thought, too, Is our liturgical chaos in parts of our United Lutheran Church any less fearful and disgraceful than it is in other synods?

I can vividly remember the meetings of the old New York and New England Synod, when we could not even sing the Communion Service, because there were five different musical settings in use and none of us knew all five. We are gradually increasing the number of congregations that are adopting the Common Service. But how many are there that still butcher, mangle, and disfigure it beyond computation?

Let more light be shed on the inner structure of the liturgy and its proper use by papers and discussions in local ministerial associations as well as by the formation of congregational study groups. We have the literature available if we are ready to use it.

Looking back over these fifty years, we have much to be thankful for in the gradual regaining of the rich liturgical heritage of our Lutheran Church. On the other hand, looking around on our present conditions in the congregations, we can all see many ways in which the use of the Service can be improved.

What suggestions can be made for pastors and congregations in celebration of this anniversary? Here are my own, just as suggestions which can be further elaborated and expanded. There are at least six

books put out by our own Publication House that give information. *Explanation of Common Service; Manual of Worship,* Strodach; *Lutheran Handbook,* Traver; *Worship,* Finck; *Catechism in Christian Worship,* Swank; *Worship Booklet,* Jones; *The Common Service,* Harry; and, last but not least, a most profitable reading for pastors and musicians is to be found in the preface of the Reed-Archer *Choral Service Book,* just lately reissued by the Publication House. All or some of this reading ought to help in producing one or more inspiring sermons on "The Service and the Church-year."

The second suggestion for this golden-anniversary year is that our Sunday-school superintendents should teach the singing of the Service, part by part, to the Juniors and Intermediates and have them memorize it. This cannot be done all at once, but it can be done, with patience, in the course of the year. And then bring those children regularly to the service to share in the worship of the congregation.

The third suggestion applies to every congregation. Improve the slovenly and drawly singing of the Service. From comments of visiting pastors I gather that in most congregations slow and painful singing of the *Gloria in Excelsis* is a universal fault. Next comes faulty and slovenly phrasing, in spite of plain marking of punctuation. Why, most of us cannot even say the Lord's Prayer correctly. This is the way we pray: "Thy will be done [pause] on earth [pause] as it is in heaven." The only place the pause belongs is after the word earth, where there is a comma.

Here in the Pittsburgh district we have tried to bring improvement by means of mass conferences of choirs and singers. But surely even the isolated Lutheran congregation can, with a little study, care, and effort, decently sing the Service.

The fourth suggestion applies to the permitted variations in the singing of the Service. These are called "the Propers of the Day," and include the Introit, Gradual, and Hallelujah sentences. Perhaps the Hallelujah sentences are the most widely used; yet there are literally hundreds of pastors and congregations that do not avail themselves of this means of diversifying the Service. A simple thing; yet why is it not brought into use?

One of the finest improvements in the singing of the Service, I believe, would be the restoration of the old churchly custom of the singing of the Introit. Can it be done by a small volunteer choir? From our own experience I would say that it can. And in our experience the simple melody of the Gregorian settings as found in the Reed-Archer *Choral Service Book* is most practicable and effective. Larger choirs may prefer the setting of Matthews or Schmauk.

The fifth suggestion is that we more frequently use the Service in its fulness and completeness. Most of our congregations have Communion services four times a year. A few have them six times, and perhaps a still smaller number increase these celebrations of the Holy Supper. As a plain matter of fact we only use the Service as intended four to six times a year. Every other service which ends with the sermon, might just as well be the Matins, for it means we are using part of the Service as a minor order.

That is not the way our Lutheran people figure it out. They think the normal order is the preaching service, and that for the Communion service something is added to the regular service. No wonder that we have so many "oncers" in our congregations, who appear once a year to make their Easter Communion. Evelyn Underhill in her book *Worship*, page 281, says: "Had the Protestant churches been true to the ideals of their founders, . . . it would have led to the practise of frequent communions." Here is one way that every congregation can be led to a deeper and more spiritual life. —

The article has been submitted *in toto* because it contains valuable material and hints for all of us. A.

Presbyterian Church of America Loses Suit to Retain Name. — *Christianity Today* (February, 1938) reports that the group which seceded in 1936 from the *Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.*, to form the *Presbyterian Church of America* was enjoined by court order on January 18, 1938, from using that name. The injunction was issued by President Judge Frank Smith in Common Pleas Court Number Five, Philadelphia. He pointed out that the similarity between the name which the secessionists chose for themselves and the official name of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is confusing. His decision declared that it would be "a serious hurt to the reputation of the [mother] Church and a detriment to its work if the [other] Church, bearing a similar name, should enter the areas already occupied by the [mother] Church, and in real competition with it, thereby destroying the faith of those individuals in foreign countries not sufficiently educated in English to comprehend the controversy existing between the organizations." But the injunction decree not only restrained the group from calling it the Presbyterian Church of America but also forbade the use of any other name "similar to, or imitative of, or contractive of, the name Presbyterian Church in the United States of America or the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., or ever doing any act or thing calculated or designed to mislead the public or members of the plaintiff Church." In their defense the officers of the new Church had declared that their purpose was "to continue what we believe to be the true principles of the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechism." To this the judge replied: "A court in equity has no jurisdiction in examining into the merits of the two respective doctrines any more than it would look into the merits of commercial products after it had concluded that one concern had misappropriated the long-established trade name of another." The litigation began in August, 1936, with the filing of a petition by officers of the parent Church. Time will be allowed the defendants to file exceptions to the injunction decree before it is made final. Whether the group will appeal or not, or whether the moderator of the new Church, the Rev. J. J. De Waard of Cedar Grove, Wis., will call a special meeting of the General Assembly to choose a new name, has not been determined. At any rate the court decision means a new victory for Liberalism over the conservative Christian forces that rallied round their brave and steadfast leader, Dr. J. G. Machen. To an outsider the court decision appears to be rather one-sided and severe. J. T. M.

Inadequate Salaries in the Southern Methodist Denomination. — Speaking at the annual meeting of the Board of Lay Activities of the Southern Methodists, held at Lake Junaluska last August, Dr. Geo. L. Morelock, as reported by *Christianity Today* (February, 1938), gave some "staggering facts" which the efforts of the Board had brought to light. Among these "staggering facts" are reported the following: "One half of the ministers of the M. E. Church, South, are inadequately supported; there is a low tide of giving to the benevolences of the Church; approximately sixty-five per cent. of the members are not enlisted at all; a large percent of the Church's ministers know apparently little of church finance and all kinds of duplication and overlapping occur in financial methods." Of the 6,181 pastoral charges studied, according to Dr. Morelock, 710 are paying their pastors less than $500 a year; 1,863 receive between $501 and $1,000; 69 per cent. of the pastors of Southern Methodism receive a salary of less than $1,501. To adjust the matter, the Mississippi Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in session recently, set a minimum salary of $1,000 annually for unmarried ministers, with a married man's scale set at $1,200 annually. Funds to provide the minimums will be raised through a plan whereby ministers in the higher-salary brackets will join with their churches in donating a small percentage of the pastors' salaries. The funds will be pooled, and payments to those whose salaries must be supplemented will be made from it. J. T. M.

Brief Items. — The one-thousandth translation of the Bible has appeared. It is a version which is intended for the Belgian Congo Territory. It is the British and Foreign Bible Society which has furnished the world this gift, constituting the one-thousandth instrument in the divine orchestra.

Think of this reception given the newly appointed Cardinal Hinsley of England when he returned from Rome! Not only were immense crowds of Catholics at the railroad station, among them the Duke of Norfolk, but "two rover scouts were handed the cardinal's red hat to take to the cathedral." The service in the cathedral was attended by the ambassadors of Brazil, France, Belgium, and Poland, the Austrian minister, and the High Commissioner of Ireland. Rome evidently is still a power to reckon with.

The Presbyterians have a college union representing fifty-four colleges in all parts of the United States. A campaign has been launched for ten million dollars to support these schools. The two chairmen of the campaign committee are Dr. John H. Finley, editor of the *New York Times*, and Dr. Arthur C. Compton of the University of Chicago.

A University of Chicago professor, Dr. Ralph Gerard, teacher of physiology, is credited with saying in New York that "as man learns more of his neural mechanisms, the hormones that modify them, the drives they generate, and the personal and social consequences of his acts, much control will undoubtedly be possible, and reason will sufficiently dominate emotion to keep a functioning civilization from perishing." What twaddle! Is the professor blind?

The daily press reports that 1,016 clergymen of the Church of England state that they during the last eight years have subscribed to the faith of the Council of Trent and have pledged themselves to preach it in their parishes. They make the claim that two thousand other clergymen are in sympathy with them. At the Church Assembly meeting in February this matter was to be one of the topics of discussion.

The Rev. E. T. Bagnall, secretary of the London Free Church Federation, announced recently that during 1938, the fourth centennial of the Reformation, he would undertake to place a Bible in every Englishman's home. "In 1538 a Bible was placed in every parish," stated Mr. Bagnall; "why not a Bible for every home in 1938?" He admits that the scheme is an ambitious one and that at least ten million Bibles will be needed. *News Bulletin N. L. C.*

Critics who question the need of foreign mission activities might consider these figures, included in a recent issue in the *Religious Digest:* The Imperial University of Tokyo recently circulated a questionnaire among its students which shows that of its 5,000 students 6 were Confucian, 8 Shintoists, 60 Christians, 300 Buddhists, 1,500 atheists, and 3,000 agnostics. — *News Bulletin N. L. C.*

Protestant Christians in Germany, in spite of tremendous difficulties, are continuing to carry on mission-work in the foreign field. According to the annual of the Evangelical Missions, entitled *Die deutsche evangelische Heidenmission,* German evangelical missions at the end of 1936 numbered 1,659 European missionaries and 12,551 salaried native workers. These people served 1,349,100 heathen Christians and 66,000 candidates for baptism. The courage of the German missions is most commendable.

Prof. Frederick C. Grant, dean and president of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary (Episcopal) at Evanston, Ill., has resigned his position and will join the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, New York, where he will become chairman of the Department of New Testament. This statement of his made recently may be passed on: "Something should be done to prevent many of the clergy's growing stale and going to seed. There are men in the ministry who have ceased to grow, have nothing in particular to give in their sermons, and whose pastoral ministry is purely mechanical. It ought to be made clear that ordination is no guarantee in itself of a livelihood regardless of a man's abilities, devotion to his work, and personal character — or the success of his ministry." Making success in the ministry a criterion of one's fitness for this holy work is of course, taken by itself, an unjustified procedure.

From San Francisco it is reported that the Methodists lost an office building in that city, the William Taylor Hotel, which has now become the Hotel Empire and whose church auditorium is being changed into a garage. The financial loss involved for Methodists is said to be $750,000.

In the *Christian Century* we read that Washington, D. C., is becoming thoroughly alarmed at the prospect "of gaining the unenviable distinction of being the 'gambling capital' of America. New York City's vigorous house-cleaning seems to have driven the racketeers to the banks of the Potomac, where thousands of small-salaried people are falling easy prey, particularly to those who work the 'numbers' game. Six thousand

men, it is said, are engaged in the highly lucrative practise of fleecing the innocent public here, and their daily intake approximates one hundred thousand dollars."

The beginning of February saw many Methodists in Chicago. The occasion was the meeting of the United Methodist Council of the Future of Faith and Service, which lasted for three days and was attended by four thousand registered persons. Addresses were delivered by Alfred M. Landon and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. The meeting was held under the auspices of the Commission on Evangelism and the Million Unit Fellowship Movement. The two-hundredth anniversary of John Wesley's Aldersgate experience on May 24, 1738, was observed.

The oldest Baptist church in the United States is observing its tercentenary this year. It is the First Church of Providence, founded by Roger Williams in 1638.

In connection with the mentioning of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Emanuel Swedenborg we are told that the church edifice of the New Jerusalem Congregation in Boston is used so much for interdenominational gatherings that it has been called "the Protestant cathedral." Is it not significant that gatherings of this kind are held in a building used for spreading the teachings of an arch-heretic?

Dr. William Pierson Merrill of the Brick Presbyterian Church in New York, a building which is now being torn down, has resigned. He is known as an outspoken Modernist. Being seventy-one years old, he quite likely retires from active church-work.

In England literary men are discussing the English of the King James Bible. One man, while admitting its great beauty, states that it places before us an alien imagery. Defenders of the Bible very properly point to the Twenty-third Psalm as being intelligible to us in spite of its Oriental picture language. A.

II. Ausland

Das Gericht über die Kirche. Das iſt der Grundgedanke des Vorworts zum laufenden Jahrgang der „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" (Nr. 1 und 2). D. Laible ſagt unter anderm: „Die Kirche ſoll wiſſen, wenn Gottes Gerichte über die Welt kommen ſollen, daß das Gericht zuerſt anfängt am Hauſe Gottes. Und wer wollte leugnen, daß das Gericht ſchon angefangen hat? Aller Lärm um die Kirche her und in der Kirche kann es nicht zudecken, daß ſie unter dem Gericht Gottes ſteht. Eine ſonderliche Aufgabe war ihr geſtellt, als im deutſchen Volk der große Umbruch geſchah. Ein neues Reich war mit einem Male gekommen, und der Kirche ſtand es zu, dem neuen politiſchen Reich mit einer innerlich erneuerten Kirche zu antworten, mitten im Volk des Umbruchs die unvergängliche Fackel des Evangeliums hochzuhalten. Denn über allem Wandel der Zeit ſteht ihr ewiger Auftrag: ‚Predigt das Evangelium!' Was wäre geworden, wenn eine Kirche in Erſcheinung getreten wäre, erfüllt von dem Feuer der Apoſtel, einig im Bekenntnis Martin Luthers! Das iſt nicht geſchehen. . . . Das erſte Wort (an dem die Prüfung geſchehen ſoll) iſt: ‚Gebet dem Staate, was des Staates iſt, und Gott, was Gottes iſt.' Das konnte im Ernſt niemals eine Frage ſein, daß die Kirche dem Staate gebe, was des Staates iſt, auch dem neuen Staat.

Hier ist Christi Befehl zu klar und das Wort des Paulus von der Obrigkeit zu eindeutig, als daß es darüber zu einem ‚Kirchenstreit' kommen durfte. Und doch ist es dazu gekommen. Man hat jenes Wort Christi vergessen, wollte nicht mehr Gott geben, was Gottes ist. . . . Die Kirche selbst wurde auf den Altar des Staates gelegt. Nicht Christus war mehr der ‚Erste', sondern der Staat, das Volk, die Rasse. Die alte Bibel wurde zerbrochen, der alte Glaube entwertet, das alte Bekenntnis antiquiert. . . . Immer weiter ging der Wagen abwärts, bis es zur öffentlichen Leugnung eines persönlichen Gottes kam. Unwillkürlich fragt man, wie dieser Absturz der Kirche der Reformation möglich war, die doch von Anfang ihren Ruhm darin hatte, Kirche des Wortes zu sein. Der Niedergang war nicht von gestern, er war längst vorbereitet. Seit der Aufklärung arbeitete ein fremder Geist an der Kirche, der ihren Leuchter erschütterte. Erst kam die Bibelkritik, als ihre Theologen Stein um Stein aus der Bibel ausbrachen, bis der ganze Bau biblischer Autorität zusammenstürzte. Die Bibelkritik wurde abgelöst von der religionsgeschichtlichen Betrachtung der Schrift; diese räumte vollends aus, was die Kritik noch hatte stehen lassen; Gott verschwand hinter der ‚Religion'. Die Stimme seiner Offenbarung war zum Schweigen gebracht. Es war noch nicht das Ende. Auch die religionsgeschichtliche Betrachtung wurde durch ein Neues abgelöst, durch ein Hereintragen der Politik in die Kirche. War es bisher noch ein geistliches Ringen gewesen, so wurde es nun ein politischer Kampf, ein Kampf um die Macht. Nicht ein Kampf gegen den Staat, sondern gegen die, die noch Gott geben wollten, was Gottes ist. Es hat nie gut getan, wenn die Kirche sich in die Politik mischte, wenn sie politische Kirche werden wollte. Hatten die Wächter geschlafen, die wachen sollten, oder traten sie zu spät auf den Plan? . . .

„‚Wer mich bekennet vor den Menschen, den will ich bekennen vor meinem himmlischen Vater.' . . . Eines bleibt der Kirche unverwehrt, das Bekenntnis. Das Bekenntnis ist aber nicht bloß in das Petruswort gefaßt ‚Du bist Christus'. Es hat eine heilige Geschichte gefunden im Kampf mit bösen Geistern und allerlei falschen Propheten; und der Geist Gottes, der die Kirche in alle Wahrheit leitet, hat ihr Bekenntnisse geschenkt, sämtlich erbaut auf jenem Felsengrund, unaufgebbare Schätze Gottes. Wir würden an Gott schuldig werden, wollten wir sie verleugnen, die Zeugnisse der Reformation, die Bekenntnisse der lutherischen Kirche. In ihrem Geist zu predigen, in ihnen die Jugend zu unterrichten, mit ihnen die Mühseligen und Beladenen aufzurichten, gehört auch zu dem Auftrag ‚Predigt das Evangelium!' Wie die äußere Gestalt der Kirche werden wird, weiß heute kein Mensch. Seltsame Kirchbaupläne hören wir sogar aus dem Munde von Theologen. . . . Aber die Kirche der Zukunft wird, es sei in welcher Form auch immer, eine Kirche des Bekenntnisses sein, oder sie wird es nicht sein. Darum mag man die wohl von Gott beraten heißen, die ohne alle Kirchenpolitik sich um das lutherische Bekenntnis gesammelt haben und sammeln."

Es sieht allerdings bös aus in der lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands. Die äußere Bedrängnis ist das Geringste. In der Kirche selbst sieht es bös aus. D. Laible hat recht, wenn er von „dem Gericht über die Kirche" redet. Theologen der lutherischen Kirche lehren unlutherisch vom heiligen Abendmahl, sie verbreiten eine synergistische Lehre von der Bekehrung, haben gar die Rechtfertigungslehre verfälscht und leugnen die wörtliche Eingebung der

Heiligen Schrift. Ja manche treiben gar ungläubige Bibelkritik. Mit Recht klagt Laible darüber, daß man nicht einig ist „im Bekenntnis Martin Luthers". Die Not der Kirche geht ihm zu Herzen. Möchten doch er und seine Gesinnungsgenossen erkennen, daß man auch in ihrem Kreise von dem lutherischen Bekenntnis abgewichen ist! Und möchten sie dann auch weiter erkennen, daß das aufrichtige Bekenntnis zur lutherischen Lehre auch die Trennung von denen fordert, die von der lutherischen Lehre abgewichen sind! Dann würde das Gericht über die Kirche seinen seligen Zweck erreicht haben.

Es ist überaus beklagenswert, daß man auch bei dem jetzigen Stand der Dinge nichts von einer Freikirche wissen will. Laible klagt also: „Und nun hat die Kirche über Nacht das Vertrauen des Staats verloren; sie soll aus ihrem Dienst am Volk entlassen werden; sie nütze ihm nichts mehr. Der Staat steht über den Konfessionen, er läßt jedem seine Religion; *aber er will die Kirche nicht mehr aus Staatsmitteln unterstützen*" (Sperrdruck von uns), „er will nicht mehr kirchenverbunden sein. Daher auch die Kirchenaustrittswelle, die jetzt durch gewisse Kreise geht, und die Meinung vieler, daß es zeitgemäßer sei, außer der Kirche zu leben. Würde diese Welle weiter gehen, so wäre das zwar nicht das Ende der Kirche, aber der Volkskirche. Die vielen Kanäle, die die Kirche zum Volk hatte in der Pflege der Jugend, in dem mancherlei Dienst durch das Wort Gottes, würden sich verschließen, und sie würde, auf ihre Anfänge zurückgestellt, nur noch Missionskirche sein. Wäre das zum Heil des Volkes?" Es ist unbegreiflich: sie können den Segen der Freikirche nicht erkennen und das Unheil der Staatsverbundenheit. „In einer bedeutsamen Schrift, ‚Völker vor und nach Christus', weist Paul Althaus nach, wie sehr die Religion nicht bloß Privatsache, sondern Volkssache ist, öffentliche Angelegenheit. . . . Im Gehorsam gegen sein Wort wird sich auch die Frage der Volkskirche lösen. Wir haben kein Recht, nach Freikirche zu rufen, solange der Bau der Volkskirche noch nicht abgebrochen ist. Wir haben die Volkskirche nicht gebaut, der HErr hat es getan; so haben wir sie auch nicht abzubrechen." Ja, die Volkskirche soll sogar von Gott geboten sein: „Weil wir unser Volk lieben, es groß und stark sehen möchten, darum erfüllt es uns mit schwerer Sorge, wenn die Volkskirche aufhören soll; darum reden wir von einem Gottesgericht über die Kirche, wenn ihr das Volk genommen wird, wenn sie den Befehl ihres HErrn nicht mehr ausführen kann: ‚Machet die *Völker*' (Sperrdruck im Original) ‚zu meinen Jüngern.'" Der Staat will die Kirche auf ihre eigenen Füße stellen — und dagegen wehrt sich die Kirche!

Aus dem „Neujahrsgruß des Lutherischen Rates an die Geistlichen" der in eben diesen Nummern der „Kirchenzeitung" veröffentlicht ist, teilen wir folgendes mit: „Aus der Kirche haben wir eine Unternehmung für allerlei fromme Veranstaltungen gemacht, um von ihr den Verdacht der Unzeitgemäßheit zu nehmen. Politische Methoden haben wir ins Handeln der Kirche herübergenommen, weil sie augenscheinlich zu großem Erfolg in der Welt führten. Wir bemühten uns, das politische Werk, das unter uns und für unsers Volkes Ehre und Freiheit mit hoher Leidenschaft und opferfreudigem, zähem Willen begonnen wurde, mit Gottes Ratschluß in eins zu bringen, und vernachlässigten darüber die Predigt des Evangeliums vom Reich in der ganzen Welt zu einem Zeugnis über alle Völker und über unser Volk, Matth. 24, 14." „Die Kirche hat in der Welt kein anderes Recht, als das Evangelium vom Reich Gottes und der Versöhnung zu verkündigen.

Darum aber wird sie immer ungesichert und in Verlegenheit um die Form ihrer irdischen Existenz in der Welt stehen. Es ist gut so, daß wir heute auch durch das politische Wort daran erinnert werden, daß die Kirche keinen Anspruch darauf hat, ansehnlich und in Herrlichkeit vor der Welt zu stehen und in ihr ein repräsentatives Leben zu führen. ‚Er wird nicht schreien noch rufen, und seine Stimme wird man nicht hören auf den Gassen', Jes. 42, 2. So allein wird die Kirche denen etwas wert, die mit sich selbst und mit der Welt nicht mehr zurechtkommen, die in sich selbst verelendet sind. . . . Zu der in Armut und verachteter Gestalt, umdrängt und bekämpft in der Welt erscheinenden und auf das Verheißungswort ihres HErrn angewiesenen und geworfenen Kirche werden die Mühseligen und Beladenen den Weg suchen und finden." E.

Religion in the Scandinavian Countries. — Writing in the *Christian Century* on the subject "Revolt in the North," Rev. Ezra P. Young, a Congregational minister of Little Falls, N. J., begins his article with this sentence: "When twenty-five million people dismiss the Church as unimportant in their daily life, it is news." He maintains that, while people in the Scandinavian countries are willing to discuss almost any subject, they are not willing to consider the subject of Church. "Except among a few Fundamentalists and ardent ritualists, the state church in Scandinavia is a dead issue." "In general, the state churches of Scandinavia are little more than a parade-place for the *élite*, a glorified military museum." In fact, he thinks signs of revolt can be witnessed. This revolt is directed against creeds "which were written for the Middle Ages." A high-school principal of Denmark is quoted as saying: "Our attitude toward the state church is one of indifference rather than opposition. You to the West expect much of your Church; we expect little, and we are not therefore disappointed." Mr. Young has found that there are few churches in Denmark with the social message. He says that, while the people are very indifferent toward the state church, they do manifest interest in the Oxford Group and in Barth's theology, and among the workers and farmers the Free Church idea has spread widely.

Whether this author is reliable in his observations and whether his antipathy to the old Gospel did not color his glasses and failed to let him see things in the true light, is a question which may well be asked. Dr. Boe, president of St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minn., addressed a letter to the *Christian Century* in which he maintains that Mr. Young's observations, though probably correct for the instances reported on, do not furnish an adequate portrayal of the situation and a basis for just generalizations. A.

The Doctrinal Status of the Anglican Church. — Much space has of late been given by the religious press to the discussion of a remarkable document which was published in England in the second half of January. The history of this document began fifteen years ago. At that time the archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Davidson) appointed a commission of twenty-five members "to consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences." Of the twenty-

five members of the commission five have died, and a sixth one has resigned because he left England. The vacancies, however, were filled in every case. The commission, so the *Manchester Guardian* informs us, has met each year for a week in September and in three years — 1934-5-6 — for a week also in March. "Between the full session the commission divided into groups, which worked on material assigned to them." And what is the outcome of these fifteen years of labor? From the paper just mentioned, which submits an exhaustive report, we glean the following:

The commission "sought to trace the boundaries within which the wide liberty of statement and of interpretation which has always been the glory of the Anglican communion is allowable. This work was theological, dealing with doctrines, not judicial, passing judgment on persons." This purpose of the commission explains why many subjects which a comprehensive statement of doctrine would have to dwell on have been omitted or treated very briefly. In other words, controversial matters only are discussed. The first section of the report, called "Prolegomena," treats of what authority the Holy Scriptures, the Church, and the creeds have. On the Scriptures the commission makes this colorless statement: "When all allowance is made for possible divergences between the records as they stand and the historic facts behind them, it remains true that the religious and moral teaching of the gospels conveys faithfully the impress made upon the Apostolic Church by the mind and personality of Jesus and thus possesses supreme authority." With respect to creeds the following paragraphs are quoted by the *Manchester Guardian:* "General acceptance, implicit if not explicit, of the authoritative formularies, doctrinal and liturgical, by which the meaning of the Gospel has been defined, safeguarded, or expressed, may reasonably be expected from members of the Church. Assent to formularies and the use of liturgical language in public worship should be understood as signifying such general acceptance without implying detailed assent to every phrase or proposition thus employed. Part 1, which occupies itself with the doctrines of God and of redemption, accepts the doctrine of divine creation." (The *Manchester Guardian* report does not say what view the commission expresses on evolution. Other reports indicate that evolution is legitimated.) The non-omnipotent God of H. G. Wells is rejected. While miracles are accepted, the commission adds: "It is felt by many that miracle has a special value, in that it is a striking demonstration of the subordination of the natural order to spiritual ends and affords particular points at which God's activity is manifested with special clarity and directness. On the other hand, it is to be recognized that many others feel it to be more congruous with the wisdom and majesty of God that the regularities such as men of science observe in nature and call laws of nature should serve His purpose without any need for exceptions on physical plane. It is important to notice that the motives leading to this view are not exclusively scientific, but that a religious interest also is involved." The meaning seems to be that those who refuse to accept miracles must not be branded as false teachers. With respect to sin the commission says: "In our view the doctrine of a universal tendency to evil in man is not bound up with

historical truth of any story of a fall." The acceptance of the Scriptural account of the virgin birth of our Lord is not insisted on. Concerning the resurrection of Christ we find this distressing paragraph: "To Christians the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the central fact in human history. And when a fact is so closely linked with such momentous and far-reaching issues in heaven and earth, it is not surprising that opinions should differ when the question is raised how much in the record of it is derived from the sheer occurrence of the fact itself and how much is due to the primitive interpretation of the fact in the minds which first perceived its transcendent significance and expressed it in forms inevitably belonging to their own manner of thought and speech." Of the ascension of Jesus the commission holds that "its physical features are to be interpreted symbolically."

Part 2 has the heading "The Church and Sacraments." Of the section dealing with the Real Presence the *Manchester Guardian* says: "The handling of the subject of the Real Presence is on familiar lines and bears witness to the approach of divergent schools of opinion, which is so marked a feature of present-day thought." This means, we suppose, that all the various teachings are declared permissible. The topics of reservation and of auricular confession, if we understand the *Manchester Guardian* correctly, are sidestepped because they belong to the realm of practise rather than of doctrine, according to the view of the commission. The prayers for the dead are said to meet with little opposition today. The following paragraph shows to what extent Scripture doctrine has been undermined: "If we extend this hope, as many feel bound to do, to a general expectation of further opportunities of grace for all, it will not be on account of specific declarations of Scripture, but rather as an inference from the Christian doctrine of God as a whole. That doctrine requires us to repudiate all conceptions of the judgment which represents God as abandoning the appeal of love and falling back on the exercise of omnipotent sovereignty to punish those who have failed to respond to the invitation of the Gospel. God is Love, and He cannot deny Himself." On views concerning angels and demons Christians are told that it is legitimate for them to suspend judgment or to interpret the language of the Bible and of the liturgy of the Church in a symbolical fashion. The *Manchester Guardian* says in conclusion of the report that "it does nothing to limit the traditional liberty of the Anglican communion. It does much to make the acceptance of the traditional doctrine of the Church easier for men of modern ways of thinking."

In the *Living Church* a correspondent from London writes: "Prominent Non-conformists [Methodists, Congregationalists, etc.] have been inclined to welcome the report; but evangelical opinion within the Church has been less sanguine. For example, one of its most earnest and distinguished representatives, Prebendary Hinde, writes: 'The first thought which springs to my mind is one of profound thankfulness that my faith rests on something more precise and more sure than this expression of Christian doctrine. . . . If the report should fall into the hands of some 'man in the street' who wants to know truth, I fear it will lead him into a morass; certainly it will not establish him in the truth of the Gospel. He will probably draw the conclusion either that

the Church does not know truth or that truth is indeed many-sided and nothing much matters." A London Jesuit is quoted by the same correspondent as seeing in the report a confirmation of the oft-repeated charge that the Church of England is riddled with Modernism. He is said to have observed: "It is inconceivable that in future the Anglican Church will take any disciplinarian action to silence any bishop or person who openly denies the Virgin Birth, the Gospel miracles of Christ, or the existence of the devil and evil spirits." Sad to say, the Jesuit is right.

A.

Warum müssen wir an der lutherischen Abendmahlslehre festhalten? Unter dieser Überschrift schreibt Prof. D. Hermann Sasse, Erlangen, in drei Nummern der „A. E. L. K." (Nr. 3 ff., 71. Jahrgang) herzensbewegende Worte an seine Mitlutheraner zur Beibehaltung der lutherischen Lehre vom heiligen Abendmahl. Eigentlich ist seine Aufsatzreihe gedacht als Antwort zu H. Gollwitzers Behauptung („Abendmahlsgemeinschaft", Beiheft 3 zur „Evangelischen Theologie" 1937), „daß einheitlich von allen heutigen Exegeten Luthers Abendmahlslehre zum mindesten in ihrer für sie so notwendigen Eindeutigkeit durch ein non liquet in Frage gestellt, darüber hinaus von den meisten bestritten wird". Der erste Aufsatz schließt mit dem Appell: „Das ist einer der schwersten Vorwürfe, den wir den Vorkämpfern von Barmen und Halle machen, daß sie das reformierte Verständnis von Kirche und Kirchengemeinschaft, Bekenntnis und Bekenntnisverpflichtung heimlich an die Stelle dessen gesetzt haben, was jahrhundertelang in der lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands gegolten hat. Die alte evangelische Kirche verpflichtete, wie es heute noch jede wirklich lutherische Kirche tut, ihre Pfarrer auf die Lehre der Bekenntnisse, weil sie die rechte Auslegung der Heiligen Schrift ist. Nach den Halleschen Beschlüssen sollen die Pfarrer darauf verpflichtet werden mit der offenen Frage, wie weit die Bekenntnisse mit der Schrift übereinstimmen. Diese Frage soll erst durch ein neues ‚echtes Hören der Schrift' entschieden werden. Es ist fraglich, ob man dann nicht besser täte, nach dem Beispiel vieler reformierten Kirchen die Lehrverpflichtung auf die Heilige Schrift als norma normans überhaupt zu beschränken. Wir jedenfalls halten uns für berechtigt, die Bekenntnisverpflichtung der Pfarrer auch in der altpreußischen Kirche ebenso ernst zu nehmen, wie unsere Väter sie genommen haben und wie jede wirklich an das lutherische Bekenntnis gebundene Kirche sie nehmen muß. Wir tun es wahrhaftig nicht ‚aus Gründen der Tradition und des Bekenntnisformalismus' — nur ein vollendeter Narr könnte meinen, heute mit solchen Motiven Kirchen aufrichten zu können —, sondern einzig und allein deswegen, weil wir im tiefsten Herzen davon überzeugt sind, und zwar auf Grund ernstesten Studiums der Heiligen Schrift und der Geschichte der Kirche überzeugt sind, daß die Lehre der Augustana (sollte heißen: der Konkordia) ‚aus Gottes Wort genommen und darin fest und wohl begründet ist'."

Im zweiten Aufsatz schreibt D. Sasse u. a. die leider nur zu wahren Worte: „Es klingt hart, wenn wir das so offen aussprechen, aber es muß um der Wahrheit willen gesagt werden. Wir Theologen haben allen Anlaß, den großen Anteil an der schweren Schuld nicht zu verleugnen, die unsere Kirchen bis an den Rand des Verderbens gebracht hat. Wir plaudern ja auch kein Geheimnis aus, sondern stellen nur fest, was jeder Student und mancher aufmerksame Predigthörer weiß: die evangelische Theologie der Gegenwart hat trotz der gewaltigen Bemühun-

gen der beiden letzten Jahrzehnte den Weg zu einem wirklich theologischen Verständnis der Bibel noch nicht wieder gefunden. (Sperrsatz im Original.) Wir haben ausgezeichnete biblische Theologen, aber wir haben keine biblische Theologie. . . . Welche Vorzüge auch immer die moderne Exegese derjenigen der Reformationen gegenüber haben mag, insbesondere auf dem Gebiet des rein sprachlichen Verstehens, den Vorzug wird kein heutiger Exeget seinen Vorgängern im 16. Jahrhundert bestreiten, daß es für sie ein einheitliches Neues Testament gab, das mehr war als eine Summe von aufeinanderfolgenden literarischen Schichten. Sollte aber nicht damit die Tatsache zusammenhängen, daß die heutige Exegese die Glaubenssätze der evangelischen Bekenntnisse, die den Reformatoren völlig evidente Schriftwahrheiten waren, nicht mehr aus der Schrift zu begründen vermag? Man sagt uns, kein heutiger Exeget finde im Neuen Testament noch Luthers Abendmahlslehre wieder. Dürfen wir uns die Gegenfrage erlauben, welchen Artikel der Augustana sich denn die moderne Exegese noch biblisch zu begründen getraue? . . . Theologen, die sich selbst zu den Verteidigern des evangelischen Glaubens gegen den Liberalismus vergangener Zeiten rechnen, geben die Lehre vom Strafleiden und vom sühnenden Opfer des Erlösers auf. Sie bestreiten, daß die Lehre von der Erbsünde sich aus der Bibel begründen läßt. Sie machen aus JEsus einen Pelagianer, der dem Menschen wenigstens die Erreichung einer relativen Vollkommenheit zutraut und die kleinen Kinder für sündlos hält. Sie protestieren gegen die Einseitigkeit, mit der man die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre zum Mittelpunkt der ganzen Schrift macht. Kurz, es gibt kaum einen Satz des kirchlichen Bekenntnisses, den die moderne exegetische Theologie — und wir reden nur von derjenigen, die bewußt kirchlich sein will — noch aus der Schrift zu begründen und den Glaubenssätzen anderer Konfessionen gegenüber zu verteidigen vermöchte. Wer uns also mehr oder minder triumphierend entgegenhält, kein moderner Exeget halte heute noch an der lutherischen Abendmahlslehre fest, dem erwidern wir, daß wir das mit Bedauern zur Kenntnis nehmen, daß wir im Grunde ja auch nichts anderes erwartet haben, daß es uns aber keineswegs gewiß sei, daß damit irgend etwas gegen die Abendmahlslehre unserer Kirche gesagt sei. Es könnte ja sein, daß die ‚neuere Forschung' sich mit ihren Anschauungen über das Abendmahl ein vernichtendes Armutszeugnis ausstellt. Die Kirche hat jedenfalls recht daran getan, wenn sie uns Theologen samt unsern Forschungsergebnissen niemals ganz so ernst genommen hat, wie wir uns selber zu nehmen pflegen. . . . Und so feiert unsere Kirche ohne jede Rücksicht auf die Meinungen, Hypothesen und Diskussionen ‚neuerer Forschung' über das heilige Abendmahl das Sakrament des Altars als das Sakrament des wahren Leibes und Blutes des HErrn in genau demselben Sinn, wie sie in ihren Bekenntnissen darüber lehrt. Sie tut das wahrhaftig nicht mit schlechtem Gewissen aus einem falschen Konservatismus, sondern weil ihr Respekt vor dem Worte Gottes immer noch größer ist als ihr Respekt vor den Hypothesen der modernen Wissenschaft." J. T. M.

Wissenschaft und Glaube. Aus dem Blatt „D. E. D." zitiert der „Luth. Herold" die folgenden auch für uns wichtigen apologetischen Angaben: „Zahlreiche deutsche Naturforscher haben in letzter Zeit zur Frage ‚Religion und Naturwissenschaft', ‚Natur und Offenbarung' das Wort ergriffen. Ihre Stimmen geben Zeugnis davon, daß ‚Religion und Wissenschaft nicht im

Widerspruch stehen'. Mit einem Vorurteil, das jahrzehntelang (seit der Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts) genährt wurde, wird damit entgültig aufgeräumt. Eine Fülle ähnlicher Zeugnisse trägt jetzt ein Werk zusammen: ‚Gott, Mensch, Technik, Wissenschaft', von **Dr. ing. E. H. M. Beekman** (Schöningh, Paderborn), der den religiösen Grundstellungen großer Naturwissenschaftler, Physiker, Mathematiker und anderer Forscher nachgegangen ist. Die zahlreichen von ihm beigebrachten Zeugnisse widersprechen eindeutig der Annahme, daß die Wissenschaft zum Monismus oder Materialismus führe. Einige Proben daraus mögen hier folgen. Aus einem Brief Voltas: ‚Ich begreife nicht, wie jemand an meiner Aufrichtigkeit und Standhaftigkeit in der Religion, zu der ich mich bekenne, zweifeln kann. Es ist mein fester Vorsatz, in diesem Glauben zu leben und zu sterben in der Hoffnung, das ewige Leben zu ererben. Diesen Glauben betrachte ich als ein Geschenk Gottes, als einen übernatürlichen Glauben.' Der Mathematiker Cauchy: ‚Ich bin ein Christ; das will sagen: ich glaube an die Gottheit JEsu Christi mit Tycho Brahe, Kopernikus, Descartes [?], Newton, Fermat, Leibnitz, Pascal, Grimaldi, Euler, Guldin, Boscowitsch, Gerdil, mit allen großen Astronomen, allen großen Naturwissenschaftlern, allen großen Mathematikern der früheren Jahrhunderte. Und wenn man mich nach dem Grund fragen sollte, würde ich ihn gern angeben. Man wird sehen, daß meine Überzeugung nicht das Ergebnis anerzogener Vorurteile, sondern das eines gründlichen Studiums ist. Ich teile die tiefe Überzeugung, die so viele hervorragende Gelehrte, wie Ruffini, Hauy, Laennec, Ampère, Pelletier, Freycinet, Coriolis, durch ihre Worte, ihre Taten und in ihren Schriften bekundet haben. Und wenn ich jetzt die Namen der noch Lebenden aus Furcht, ihre Bescheidenheit zu verletzen, nicht nenne, so will ich doch die Namen meiner berühmten Freunde aufzählen, bei denen ich zu meiner Freude den Adel und die Großmut [?] des christlichen Glaubens gefunden habe. Es sind dies: der Schöpfer der Kristallographie, Hauy; die Erfinder des Chinins und des Stethoskops, Pelletier und Laennec; der berühmte Seefahrer an Bord der „Urania", Freycinet, und der unsterbliche Schöpfer der dynamischen Elektrizität Ampère.' Der Astronom Puiseur: ‚Die verdorrenden, dem religiösen Empfinden feindlichen Lehren entspringen jedesmal einer Geisteseinstellung, in der der wahre Gelehrte nicht verharren kann. Wieviel bedeutender und anziehender ist für ihn die Forschung, wenn er an eine freie und höchste Intelligenz glaubt, die die Welt beseelt, wenn er weiß, daß vom kosmischen Nebel bis zum Atom jedes Ding uns etwas offenbaren kann von einer Ordnung, die aus dem Ewigen ist.' " Alles Apologetische leidet ja an einer gewissen Unsicherheit und Schwäche, so daß man geneigt ist, ab und zu Fragezeichen an den Rand zu setzen. Und doch sind dergleichen Gelehrtenzeugnisse trotz allen Mangels deswegen wertvoll, weil sie bezeugen, daß Wissenschaft an und für sich nicht gottlos macht. Wird die Wahrheit unterdrückt und die Lüge verbreitet, so hat dies auch in einem Gelehrten seinen Grund in der ἀσέβεια und ἀδικία des verderbten Fleisches. (Vgl. Röm. 1, 18.) J. T. M.

Book Review — Literatur

Stuttgarter Jubiläumsbibel. In Taschenformat, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen. 1138, 440, 24 Seiten, mit 14 Seiten Karten und Photographien 4¼×7, 1⅛ Zoll dick. Preis: RM. 4.80.

Der Text dieser Bibel, die eine wirkliche Prachtleistung des Druckers und Buchbinders darstellt, ist derselbe wie in der Paläſtina-Bilderbibel. Aber die Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt hat diesem Texte erklärende Anmerkungen beigegeben. Der Verwaltungsrat schreibt im Vorwort: „Ganz gewiß bedarf die Heilige Schrift nicht erst unserer menschlichen Anmerkungen, Zusätze und Umschreibungen, damit sie als das Werkzeug der göttlichen Gnade an der Menschheit, in der Kirche Christi und an unsern Seelen ihren Dienst ausrichte. Sie ist ohne uns in sich selbst vermögend, zur Seligkeit weise zu machen; und wenn wir sie nur betend, suchend, anklopfend benutzen, so schließt Gott vom Himmel her sie uns auf, gibt uns und läßt uns finden, was jeder in seinem Teil, für sein Leben und für seine ewige Zukunft bedarf und was die Kirche Christi und die Menschheit je nach den Zeitläuften, durch die sie hindurchgeführt wird, nötig hat." Die wichtigsten Anmerkungen, die dem Bibeltext beigegeben sind, erklären Namen, geschichtliche Ereignisse, allgemeine Zeitumstände und Ähnliches mehr. Wir können leider nicht immer allen Ausführungen beistimmen, so schon der von Gen. 1, 5 nicht, wo dem modernen Unglauben ein Zugeständnis gemacht wird. Aber im ganzen sollte diese Ausgabe für den vorsichtigen Pastor von großem Wert sein.

P. E. Kretzmann

The Great Physician. By G. Campbell Morgan. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 400 pages, 5½×8¼. Price, $2.50.

G. Campbell Morgan, the well-known evangelist and expositor, is a prolific writer. He is a Fundamentalist, believing in the inspiration of the Bible and in the deity and vicarious atonement of Christ. His style is pleasing, fluent, clear, vivid, often displaying great beauty. The Great Physician, of course, is Jesus, and the purpose of the book is to acquaint the reader with the methods of Jesus in approaching the individual. After the opening chapter on the Physician Himself, the author offers 49 brief biographies of as many characters met in the New Testament, men and women, and points out how Christ in the days of His flesh and as the exalted Head of the Church deals with each person according to his individuality, always with the purpose of gaining him for the Kingdom or strengthening him in the faith. The book is replete with timely and striking observations, as, *e. g.*, when he defines the "world" which Demas loved, as "the *Zeitgeist*, the time spirit, the spirit that dominated the age," and makes the application: "The phrase of the apostle, apparently so innocuous and harmless, is in fact an arresting revelation of the reason why so often in Christian life there is relapse. There is something in the time spirit which makes its appeal, and Demas had felt this; he had felt the enticement of its gifts." Demas "felt the enticement of the seen as against the unseen, the tangible as against the intangible, the sensual as against the spiritual, the present as against the future." (Pp. 387, 388.) The author teaches the Reformed doctrine of the Sacraments, labors under the confused and unbiblical Reformed concep-

tion of repentance, of a preparatory state, an intermediate state between unbelief and faith, fails to stress the atoning sacrifice of Christ and faith in this atonement as the very heart and essence of Christianity, and substitutes the Spirit for the Word of God as the means of creating and preserving faith. He also frequently reads too much between the lines and makes deductions and statements not warranted by the text. From Acts 8:1, "Saul was consenting unto his death," he draws the conclusion that Saul was a member of the Sanhedrin, because consent "indicates the casting of a vote." It does not. Cp. all the passages in which this word occurs: Acts 22:20; Luke 11:48; Rom. 1:32; 1 Cor. 7:12, 13. Philip, in John 1:46, does not "name the third division, the Kethubim, or Writings"; yet this fact surely does not warrant the statement found on p. 43: "Again let it be remembered that an argument from silence is to be taken carefully; but it is at least suggestive that he does not seem to have been as interested with the poetry of his people as with the Law and the Prophets." What about Christ, Matt. 7:12, and Paul, Rom. 3:21? These and other errors, deficiencies, and inaccuracies, found throughout the book, mar its beauty and detract from its value. TH. LAETSCH

Outline Studies in Luke. By John L. Hill, Book Editor, Sunday-school Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 182 pages, 5½×8. Price, $2.00. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Among the many books that have been written with the intention of assisting pastors and Sunday-school teachers and teachers in general in presenting the contents of Biblical books, the present volume deserves mention. While it does not offer long exegetical discussions, it outlines the contents of Luke's gospel very clearly and makes it an easy matter for the leader of a discussion group to give his students a good survey of the contents of our third gospel. There are twenty-five chapters, at the head of each one of which there is an indication of the topics treated in the respective section. Great simplicity of thought and diction characterize the volume, not to its disadvantage. That the book teaches the Reformed view of the Lord's Supper, saying with respect to the words of institution: "This is one of the strongest metaphors in literature" (p. 154); that the term "redeemed" is used in the sense of "converted" (p. 157), should not remain unmentioned. Paging through the book, one notices that the works of the late Dr. A. T. Robertson are drawn on now and then. The paper and the print and the spacing of lines are most commendable. Our pastors will find the volume helpful.

W. ARNDT

Martin Luther: Vom unfreien Willen. Eine Kampfschrift gegen den Mythus aller Zeiten aus dem Jahre 1525. Nach dem Urtext neu verdeutscht von Otto Schumacher. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1937. 228 Seiten 6¼×9¼. Preis, gebunden in Leinen: RM. 4.80. Auslandspreis: RM. 3.60.

Mit diesem Buch hat der Übersetzer sowie der Herausgeber der lutherischen Kirche und der ganzen Kirche einen großen Dienst erwiesen. Bedrängen doch die seelengefährlichen Irrlehren (Werkgerechtigkeit, grober und feiner Synergismus),

denen Luther in seiner gewaltigen Schrift *De Servo Arbitrio* — „Daß der freie Wille nichts sei" — entgegentrat, die Kirche heute in demselben wie vordem oder gar in noch höherem Maße. Es handelt sich um den Mythus aller Zeiten. Mit Recht heißt es in der Einführung: „Der Kampf, den Luther gegen Erasmus führt, gehört nicht nur der Vergangenheit an. Jede Gegenwart hat ihn neu zu bestehen, und niemandem bleibt er erspart. . . . Die Kampfschrift Luthers vom unfreien Willen hat bleibenden Wert. . . . Das Buch will nicht nur einmal gelesen und dann weggelegt werden. Es enthält ein ganzes Waffenlager, das für den unvermeidlichen Geistes- und Glaubenskampf bereitsteht." Wir Lutheraner müssen uns mit Luthers *De Servo Arbitrio* möglichst vertraut machen. Dabei wird uns die vorliegende Neuübersetzung gute Dienste leisten. Wer den 18. Band der St. Louiser Ausgabe von Luthers Schriften nicht besitzt, schaffe sich dieses Separatheft an. Darin „sind die bisher vorhandenen Übersetzungen, nämlich die von Justus Jonas und die von Otto Scheel, durchgehend verglichen worden. Berücksichtigt wurden ferner die Berichtigungen, die C. Stange erarbeitet hat (Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie VI, S. 120 ff.). Ebenso eine umfangreiche Literatur. . . . Lesehilfen: Sperrungen heben den sachlichen Gehalt des Buches hervor, während das Inhaltsverzeichnis zugleich der formalen Übersicht dient. Die Anmerkungen geben die notwendigsten Sacherläuterungen". — Die Übersetzung selbst ist gut geraten, bewegt sich in möglichst kurzen Sätzen und bedient sich einfacher Sprache, und zwar der Sprache unsers Jahrhunderts. Uns gefällt in mancher Beziehung die Übersetzung der St. Louiser Ausgabe besser. Diese bedient sich auch einer gemeinverständlichen Sprache, hat aber mehr von dem Stil der deutschen Schriften Luthers. Dennoch wird keiner es bereuen, Luther in der Schumacherschen Übersetzung zu lesen. — Wir geben einige Proben: „Der Heilige Geist, der den Christen vom Himmel her gegeben wird, soll Christum in ihnen aufleuchten lassen und ihn bis zu ihrem Tode bekennen" (S. 21). Cole-Atherton: **"The Holy Spirit is given unto them from heaven that He may glorify Christ and confess Him even unto death."** St. Louis: „Der Heilige Geist wird ihnen vom Himmel gegeben, damit er Christum verkläre und er [Christus] bis zum Tode bekannt werde. **[Confiteatur** steht hier passivisch]" (XVIII, 1676). Weimar Ausg., 18, 603: **„ut clarificet Christum et confiteatur usque ad mortem"**. Schumacher, S. 227: „Meine ganz besondere Anerkennung spreche ich dir dafür aus, daß du als Erster und als Einziger die Sache selbst angegriffen hast, für die ich kämpfe. Du hast dich wirklich an die Hauptsache gehalten." Cole-Atherton: **"You alone have entered upon the thing itself, that is, the grand turning-point of the cause."** St. Louis: „Allein du hast den Hauptangelpunkt erkannt und das Messer an die Kehle gesetzt" (S. 1967). W. A.: **„Unus tu et solus cardinem rerum vidisti et ipsum iugulum petisti."** Schumacher: „Doch machen wir den Mummenschanz einmal mit!" Cole-Atherton: **"Let me turn to ghostraising also!"** St. Louis: „So wollen auch wir eine Larve vornehmen" (1827). Schumacher: „Lucian, dieser bedeutende Kopf!" St. Louis: „Lucian, der einen so hohen Verstand hatte" (S. 1759). Sch.: „Diese Worte treffen den freien Willen schwer." St. L.: „Hier redet Luther lauter Blitze gegen den freien Willen" (S. 1933). C.-A.: **"Thunderbolts."** W. A.: **„Fulmina."** Sch.: „Du [Erasmus] bist voll von Lucian und versetzt mich in einen großartigen epikureischen Rausch." C.-A.: **"To me you breathe out nothing but Lucian and draw in the gorging surfeit of Epicurus."** St. L.: „Lucian redet aus dir ganz und gar, und du dufteſt mir den großen Rausch des Epikur entgegen" (S. 1684). W. A.: **„Totus Lucianum**

spiras et inhalas mihi grandem Epicuri crapulam." Zu den Worten „quod *Petrus vester* vobis mandavit" macht Sch. die Anmerkung „Der Papst", während St. L. hinzusetzt „[1 Petr. 3, 15]" (1732). Noch eine Probe, um Schumachers Stil zu kennzeichnen (und um Luft zum Lesen Luthers zu machen): „Von mir selber bekenne ich: Wenn ich zu wählen hätte, wünschte ich mir keine Willensfreiheit. Ich möchte nicht die Möglichkeit haben, mich um meine Seligkeit selber zu bemühen. Denn wie dann bestehen? Es gibt so viele Anfechtungen und Gefahren, es bedrängen den Menschen so viele böse Geister — von denen jeder einzelne stärker ist als alle Menschen zusammen —, daß niemand selig werden könnte. . . . Doch Gott hat mir die Sorge um meine Seligkeit abgenommen. Ich weiß jetzt, daß meine Seligkeit von seinem und nicht von meinem Willen abhängt. Er hat verheißen, mich zu retten, nicht durch mein Tun und Laufen, sondern durch seine Gnade und Barmherzigkeit. Jetzt habe ich Gewißheit. Denn Gott ist treu. Er belügt mich nicht. Er ist so mächtig und so groß, daß kein böser Geist, keine Anfechtung ihn stürzen und mich ihm entreißen kann" (S. 222). Vgl. St. L., Kol. 1961. — Man nehme also *De Servo Arbitrio* zur Hand in der St. Louiser oder der Cole-Athertonschen oder der vorliegenden Übersetzung — wenn nur Luther gelesen wird. — Viele unserer Pastoren greifen lieber nach einer englischen Übersetzung. Die von Cole-Atherton ist gut; aber ihr Englisch ist etwas veraltet. Könnte wohl eine Neuübersetzung veranstaltet werden? Man sage nicht, daß die missourischen Pastoren nicht mehr für so etwas Zeit hätten!

Th. Engelder

Christian Prayer. By Wm. Arndt. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 67 pages, 5¼×7¼. Price, 60 cts.

This fine essay on Christian prayer was originally prepared for, and read at, the convention of the Oklahoma District of our Missouri Synod, May, 1937. It was so well received that the District asked Concordia Publishing House to render it accessible to wider circles by publishing it in book form. This was done, and now this excellent and much-needed monograph on Christian prayer is being presented to our readers with the request for thorough and general study. There are twenty-four chapters, each of which emphasizes some important phase of Christian prayer and each of which is preeminently timely in our age, in which there is so much ignorance, doubt, and misunderstanding with regard to Christian prayer. We hope that this book will find many interested friends and accomplish much good when perused within and without our church circles. The essay breathes a warm personal spirit, since, when writing it, Dr. Arndt manifestly had in mind his sainted wife, who during her long and severe illness was unusually triumphant in prayer and to whose memory therefore the book is fitly dedicated.

J. Theodore Mueller

Christ is Risen. Possible Promises Proved. Reprinted from *Easter Bells* by William Dallmann, D. D. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. 28 pages. Price, 15 cts. Order from Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This excellently written and beautifully furnished apologetic tract, which strikingly proves the resurrection of our blessed Lord, ought to be spread by the thousands within and without American church circles. To peruse it means to experience genuine spiritual pleasure and to have

one's faith in the risen Redeemer mightily strengthened. We are sure that this exquisite brochure will be warmly welcomed also outside our own church circles. J. Theodore Mueller

Modern Religious Liberalism. The Destructiveness and Irrationality of Modernist Theology. By John Horsch. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago. 316 pages, 5½×8. Price, $1.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

There is no doubt that not only much of the spiritual indifferentism and apostasy during recent years but also, as a result, many of our bad social and economic conditions are a result of the inroads which Modernism has made into the churches of America. A number of years ago John Horsch wrote his book *Modern Religious Liberalism*, in which he ably and frankly exposed the real nature of Modernism. This book has now been printed in a third and revised edition. Considerable new material has been added, and some material of minor importance has been eliminated. A chapter on Communism has been added. We again recommend to our pastors and laymen to make a careful study of this book. Our pastors especially ought to know the religious trend of our times and be well qualified to counteract, with the unerring Word of God, the evil influences which Modernism is exerting in this country and warn of the danger, of which our own people are not exempt. We ought to be very thankful that the Lord, during the past centuries, has kept for us His Word in its truth and purity. However, we ought not to keep this Word for ourselves, but make it known also to others. The need as well as the opportunity of so doing is not lacking. Mr. Horsch dedicated this third edition of his book to Prof. J. Theodore Mueller, Th. D., "in grateful appreciation." J. H. C. Fritz

Primitive und fernöstliche Religionen. Von Prof. Richard Grützmacher. A. Deichertsche Buchhandlung, Leipzig. 1937. 49 Seiten 6×9. Preis, kartoniert: RM. 1.50.

Dies ist das erste Heft in einer Serie von fünf Lieferungen über „Religionsgeschichtliche Charakterkunde". Im Interesse des Evolutionismus haben Religionsgeschichte und -philosophie nachzuweisen versucht, daß alle Religionen, einschließlich der christlichen, sich vom Animismus zum Monotheismus entwickelt hätten (Wellhausen, Tröltsch, Söderblom usw.). Demgegenüber haben namentlich Andrew Lang und der katholische G. W. Schmidt (Ursprung der Gottesidee) die These verteidigt, daß die Religionen der heutigen kulturarmen Völker deutlich zeigen, daß die ursprüngliche Religion monotheistisch war.

D. Grützmacher behauptet, daß sich weder die eine noch die andere These beweisen lasse. Der leitende Gedanke seiner Untersuchung ist: „Die Grundbegriffe von Macht, Geist, Heiligkeit sind der Bestand aller primitiven Religionen"; denn in allen Religionen finde man die Machtvorstellung im Fetischismus und Totemismus, den Glauben an ein geistiges Leben nach dem Tode im Animismus, Seelenkult, Animatismus, und den Ansatz zu einer Sittenlehre in der Tabuvorstellung. (S. 3—15)

Von diesem Gesichtspunkte aus schildert der Verfasser (S. 16—49) die altchinesische Himmelsreligion und die Sozialethik des Confuzius, Laotse und Taois-

mus und die altjapanische Shintoreligion. Die Abhandlung zeigt, wie in China die Religion sich nicht für den einzelnen, sondern für die großen Gemeinschaften, z. B. Familie, Freundschaft, Staat, interessiert und wie in Japan das Vaterland Zentrum der Religion ist. F. E. Mayer

An Introduction to Medieval Europe, 300—1500. By James Westfall Thompson and Edgar Nathaniel Johnson. 1092 pages. Illustrated. W. W. Norton & Co., New York, N. Y. Price, $5.50. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

James Westfall Thompson is Sidney Hellman Ehrman Professor of European History at the University of California and author of a number of important works in this field. The present volume is a revision of his *History of the Middle Ages, 300—1500*, done by Edgar Nathaniel Johnson, associate professor of History at the University of Nebraska. Professor Johnson writes: "Professor Thompson put at my disposal a manuscript in which he had made many alterations from the original text. I am deeply obligated to him . . . for the unlimited freedom he granted me to reorganize, rewrite, and expand his manuscript." The result of this collaboration is in this reviewer's opinion a most excellent piece of work. In twenty-nine chapters this great period in the history of the world and the Church is depicted with the bold strokes of a master artist, so that the reader's interest is aroused and held as grippingly as if it were a dramatically written historical novel. Whether dealing with the intricate questions connected with the great doctrinal controversies of the Church or with the complicated systems of feudalism and manorialism, the authors succeed in presenting their story in such a way that even the layman of average intelligence will enjoy and appreciate it. Professor Johnson has really accomplished what he set out to do when he wrote: "I have tried to remember that history, in the final analysis, must also be a history of ideas and that at the same time it must also be refreshed constantly by intimate contact with warm human beings and the homely facts of daily life." It would be tedious to the reader to give here all the chapter headings in order to show the well-thought-out arrangement of the material; but a few shall be stated by way of illustration (the Roman numerals indicate the chapters): I. The Greco-Oriental Conquest of the Roman Empire. II and III. The Christian Conquest of the Roman Empire. IV and V. The German Conquest of the Roman Empire. VIII. The Civilization of Early Western Europe. XIV. The Apex and Decline of the Holy Roman Empire. XVIII. Western Europe Encroaches on Islam. The Crusades. XX. The Urban Revolution. The Gilds. XXVIII. The Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Among the valuable features of the book are the illustrations, 61 half-tones and 22 line-cuts. There are six colored maps and 32 maps in black and white. There are fourteen genealogical tables and fourteen pages of references for further reading, together with a comprehensive index covering 23 pages. Considering the number of pages, the sturdy binding, the many fine illustrations and the maps, the price of the volume is very reasonable. W. G. Polack

My Beloved Armenia. By Marie Sarrafian Banker. The Bible Institute Colportage Ass'n, Chicago. 205 pages. Price, $1.25.

A tale of that land which has perhaps seen more persecutions than any other, written by a woman who spent her early girlhood hiding in caves from the Turks and, after the war, lost her family, relatives, and friends at the hands of the Turk. A simple story, written for simple people, of which much might better have remained unwritten, giving, however, a little intimate glance into Armenian life and suffering.

THEO. HOYER

Das Alte Teſtament im kirchlichen Unterricht. Von Gerhard Schmidt. Chr.-Kaiſer-Verlag, München. 1937. 144 Seiten 6×9. Preis: Geheftet, RM. 2.80; gebunden, RM. 3.80.

Es iſt ſelbſt für einen Paſtor, der nur engliſchen Unterricht erteilt, von großem Wert, wenn er auch in bezug auf die Neuerſcheinungen in der Pädagogik im Auslande, beſonders auch in Deutſchland, etwas auf dem laufenden bleibt. Dabei können dieſe Betrachtungen dem Lehrer des Alten Teſtaments gute Dienſte leiſten. Der erſte Teil gibt eine allgemeine Überſicht über Kritik des Alten Teſtaments, Methodik und verwandte Fragen. Der zweite Teil bietet 38 Betrachtungen über altteſtamentliche Geſchichten. Die Vorzüge des Buches ſind hauptſächlich die vielen Zitate von Luther. Und man muß zugeben, was geboten wird, iſt informierend, anregend. Aber es finden ſich auch viele Zugeſtändniſſe an die moderne Bibelkritik, denen wir nicht beiſtimmen können. Warum die vielen ausfälligen Bemerkungen, die ſehr oft die bibliſchen Ausſagen über die Verfaſſerſchaft in Zweifel ziehen? Warum nicht durchweg bibel- und bekenntnistreu? Immerhin: Das Buch, mit Vorſicht gebraucht, hat großen Wert. P. E. Kretzmann

Asleep in Jesus. Funeral Sermons. By J. H. Hartenberger. 135 pages, 5×7½. Price, $1.25, postpaid.

The sainted Pastor J. H. Hartenberger was known in our circles as a gifted preacher, and his published sermons found a ready sale. This collection of funeral sermons, prepared for publication by a son of the author, bears witness to the thorough Bible knowledge and pastoral experience which characterized the sainted author. We have here the words of one who has tasted the cup of sorrow and has drunk deep of the well-spring of salvation, whose mouth therefore spoke out of the abundance of his heart. The little volume will prove to be a welcome addition to the libraries of our pastors. Order directly from the editor, Pastor H. W. Hartenberger, Hooker, Okla. TH. LAETSCH

Associated Lutheran Charities. Thirty-sixth annual convention, August 31 to September 3, 1937. 159 pages, 6×9. Price, $1.00.

This report has become a desideratum for every pastor who wants to remain abreast of the charities movement in our own circles. The report is comprehensive, containing not only the full roster of the affiliated organizations and their delegates, but all the reports, addresses, and institute outlines, as well as the convention sermon. Only by studying this report shall we be able to give constructive assistance to a very earnest and active group in our midst. P. E. KRETZMANN

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:

Who Has Redeemed Me. Daily Devotional Readings for Lent, March 2 to April 17. By Alfred Doerffler. 63 pages, 3½×5¾. Price: Single copy, 5 cts., postpaid; dozen, 48 cts., and postage; 100, $3.00, and postage.

O Lamm Gottes Unschuldig. Von Prof. Theodor Lätsch. 62 Seiten 3½×5¾. Preis: Das Stück 5 Cts., portofrei; das Dutzend 48 Cts. und Porto; 100: $3.00 und Porto.

From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

The Jews and the Passion for Palestine in the Light of Prophecy. By Keith L. Brooks. 100 pages, 5×7¾. Price, $1.00.

The Christian's Resurrection Body; Its Nature and Characteristics. By Laurence William Miller. 48 pages, 5×7¾. Price, 35 cts.

Daily Manna. A wall calendar of daily devotions for every day of the year. Edited by Martin Monsma. Price, 75 cts.

Smoking and Other Habits; Their Effects and Cures. A medical and scientific discussion of the tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and opium habits. By Frank Leighton Wood, M. D. 68 pages. Price, 25 cts.

Helen Kennedy-Christian. By Wynema Atherton. 107 pages. Price, 75 cts.

These Religious Affections. By Harold John Ockenga. 159 pages. Price, $1.00.

From Eden Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:

Jesus of the Twentieth Century. By Herman J. Schick. 119 pages. Price, $1.25.

From Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, N. Y.:

Children's Everyland Story Sermons. By Hugh Thomas Kerr, Pastor, Shadyside Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa. 185 pages, 7½×5. Price, $1.50.

From the Macmillan Co., New York, N. Y.:

Swords into Ploughshares. By Mary Hoxie Jones. An Account of the American Friends Service Committee, 1917—1937. 374 pages, 8¼×5½. Price, $3.00.

From Fundamental Truth Publishers, Findlay, O.:

Harp A-Thrumming. By Frederick H. Sterne. 144 pages, 5½×8. Price, $1.00.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us—one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Apr 38" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance. When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.